299.934
THE
110

ULT LIBRARY
BANGALORE.
Accn. No 110

LIBRARY COPY

# THEOSOPHY

A MAGAZINE DEVOTED TO

THE THEOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT, AND THE BROTHERHOOD OF HUMANITY

THE STUDY OF OCCULT SCIENCE AND PHILOSOPHY, AND ARYAN LITERATURE

**Vol. XLVI—No. 1** **November, 1957**

*THE great archaic system known from prehistoric ages as the sacred Wisdom Science, one that is contained and can be traced in every old as well as in every new religion, had, and still has, its universal language. The many-sided facets of the mystery language have led to the adoption of widely varied dogmas and rites in the exotericism of the Church rituals. It is they, again, which are at the origin of most of the dogmas of the Christian Church, e.g., the seven Sacraments, the Trinity, the Resurrection; the seven Capital Sins and the seven Virtues.*

—H. P. BLAVATSKY

ULT LIBRARY
BANGALORE.
Accn. No 110

CONTENTS

TWO MORALITIES ..... 1
THE T. S.: ITS MISSION AND ITS FUTURE ..... 7
A DREAM FULFILLED ..... 21
NOTES ON THE TAO TE KING ..... 22
PRINCIPLES IN DAILY LIFE ..... 26
KNOWLEDGE VS BELIEF ..... 29
THE ROOT OF BEING ..... 30
GROWTH OF AWARENESS ..... 31
YOUTH-COMPANIONS ASK—AND ANSWER ..... 32
MAN IS NOT A THING ..... 35
ON THE LOOKOUT ..... 41

*$3.50 per Annum* *35 Cents per Copy*

*Edited and Published by*

THE THEOSOPHY COMPANY

245 West 33rd Street, Los Angeles 7, California, U. S. A.

110
299.934
THIE

## Publisher's Announcements

THEOSOPHY: Established November, 1912, by Robert Crosbie. Published monthly by The Theosophy Company, at Los Angeles, California, U. S. A. This Magazine is edited independently of any theosophical society or other organization. The Publishers assume full responsibility for all unsigned articles herein.

SUBSCRIPTIONS: No subscriptions are accepted for less than one year of 12 numbers, but subscriptions may begin with any desired number. All subscriptions, orders for single back numbers, and back volumes, bound or unbound, should be accompanied by the necessary remittance. Price $3.50 per annum; single numbers of the current volume, 35 cents each; back numbers, 50 cents each; back volumes, unbound, $5.00 each; for library style binding, prices on request. *Volumes I and XII are out of print.*

COMMUNICATIONS: Contributions submitted for publication should be typewritten double-spaced on one side of the paper only, with wide margins, and copies should be in all cases retained by the writers, as no manuscripts are returned.

CORRESPONDENCE: Letters from subscribers and readers are welcomed, with criticisms, comments or questions on any subject treated in the magazine. Questions on Theosophical Philosophy and History will be replied to direct, or, if of sufficient general interest, in the pages of the Magazine.

BEQUESTS AND DONATIONS: Gifts and legacies will be gladly received from those in sympathy with the objects of this Magazine when such benefactions are unencumbered and unrestricted. Donors should make their gifts to

THE THEOSOPHY COMPANY, of Los Angeles, California, U. S. A., which is an incorporated association, legally empowered to receive such donations and bequests in furtherance of its objects. These objects are:

(*a*) To form the nucleus of a Universal Brotherhood of Humanity, without distinction of race, creed, sex, caste, or color;

(*b*) The study of ancient and modern religions, philosophies and sciences, and the demonstration of the importance of such study; and

(*c*) The investigation of the unexplained laws of Nature and the psychical powers latent in man.

*NOW AVAILABLE*

INDEX TO THEOSOPHY MAGAZINE — Volumes 1 through 43 — 1912-1955, sewed book, paper covers, 192 pp. .....$5.00

THE THEOSOPHY COMPANY
245 West 33rd Street
Los Angeles 7, California, U. S. A.

Maitri-Bhavan
15, Sir Krishna Rao Road,
BANGALORE-4, South India.

A U M

While animosity prevails, the weight of mankind's approval is on the side of affiliation. —GORDON W. ALLPORT

# THEOSOPHY

Vol. XLVI November, 1957 No. 1

## TWO MORALITIES

THE dilemma of Arjuna, from which he is finally freed by submitting himself entirely to the insight of Krishna, is produced by the pressure of two moralities—two differing conceptions of good and evil. The great dialogue between Arjuna and his teacher begins as a debate, Arjuna arguing the case for one morality—the traditional, conventional morality—and Krishna taking the position of the spiritual intelligence, free from social custom or any external compulsion. A point is reached, however, when Arjuna stops debating and begins to listen. This permits Krishna to give the symmetry of spiritual perception its full scope. As evidence of the change in Arjuna's attitude, Krishna opens the ninth discourse with the words: "*Unto thee who findeth no fault,* I will now make known this most mysterious knowledge, coupled with a realization of it, which having known thou shalt be delivered from evil."

The knowledge imparted by Krishna is "mysterious" on two counts. There is first the fact that Arjuna, alone of all the Pandu host, has come to a realization that there is a difference between inward and outward morality. From this realization arises his depression, for righteousness, once a simple thing to be determined by examining the line of conduct which has the social approval of his time, is now shown to be something quite different. At the outset of the war, then, Arjuna is to be distinguished from the other contestants by the fact that he is troubled in mind.

The first sort of "mystery," therefore, is involved in the fact that this knowledge is not even suspected to exist by the great mass of men,

who accept the prevailing conceptions of morality. Penetration of the first mystery brings only disturbance and insecurity to Arjuna. In the sixth discourse, he asks:

> "What end, O Krishna, doth that man attain who, although having faith, hath not attained to perfection in his devotion because his unsubdued mind wandered from the discipline? Doth he, fallen from both, like a broken cloud without any support, become destroyed, O strong-armed one, being deluded in the path of the Supreme Spirit? Thou, Krishna, shouldst completely dispel this doubt for me, for there is none other to be found able to remove it."

This question follows an invitation by Krishna for Arjuna to undertake the quest for direct perception of the truth, through the practice of yoga. Krishna had predicted (Chapter II) that Arjuna would by this means eventually attain to "high indifference" to all doctrines or "teachings," and would find his mind "liberated from the Vedas."

But for one who has believed that the duties of man are all properly set forth in traditional religion, such "independence" is a frightening prospect. If he deserts the path of conventional morality, yet fails to become a yogi, what then? Mr. Judge's footnotes in explanation of this question are helpful:

> "From both" ["fallen from both"] here means good Karma resulting from good deeds and spiritual knowledge acquired through yoga, or heaven and emancipation.
>
> "Without any support" refers to the support or sanction contained in the Brahmanical law in its promises to him who keeps it, for he who practices yoga is not abiding by the promises of the law, which are for those who obey the law and refrain from yoga.

On this basis, Arjuna's bewilderment and uncertainty are easy to understand. At the beginning of Chapter III, he is almost resentful toward Krishna, who has upset the simplicity of the conventional "good life" for Arjuna. He reproaches the teacher: "Thou, as it were with doubtful speech, confusest my reason; wherefore choose one method amongst them by which I may obtain happiness and explain it unto me."

Now this, of course, is precisely what Krishna cannot do, which brings us to the second "mystery." Krishna cannot "lay out a program" for Arjuna's spiritual development for the reason that spiritual development consists in laying out one's own program for oneself, and learning from both the successes and the mistakes.

The two moralities in which Arjuna is involved are now plain enough. One is the morality of conformity, the other is the morality of discovery, and the practice of one always seems to exclude or violate the other. Actually, these moralities proceed in two quite different theaters or planes of action. The morality of conformity has the psychic nature for its field, while the morality of discovery involves higher *Manas* and the creative, spiritual being. The difficulty arises from the fact that the disciple always has intimations of the importance of the morality of discovery long before he is perfect in the morality of conformity. In fact, a being perfect in the morality of conformity is hardly conceivable, save as a *Dharmakaya.* The Dharmakaya's salvation is a mere statistical affair, a completed contract with the law of Karma, without perception of the incommensurable reality of the Higher Self.

There is an interesting answer to Arjuna's demand for "one method" of development in *Light on the Path*:

> To each temperament there is one road which seems the most desirable. But the way is not found by devotion alone, by religious contemplation alone, by ardent progress, by self-sacrificing labor, by studious observation of life. None alone can take the disciple more than one step onward. All steps are necessary to make up the ladder. The vices of men become steps in the ladder, one by one, as they are surmounted. The virtues of men are steps indeed, necessary—not by any means to be dispensed with. Yet, though they create a fair atmosphere and a happy future, they are useless if they stand alone. The whole nature of man must be used wisely by the one who desires to enter the way.

It is an interesting fact of human nature—and a fact of history as well—that the spiritual teacher is always resisted in the name of self-righteousness. Arjuna quotes the morality of conformity against Krishna's advice. Jesus was opposed for violating the dictates of conventional religion. Socrates was executed for offenses against Athenian religion and Bruno was burned for his heretical teachings. It is always the morality of conformity which opposes the morality of discovery. Not a single attack on H.P.B. could have been made without the force of the morality of conformity. Mr. Judge's offenses were the same. He did not behave as other people thought he *ought* to behave.

There is of course a place for the morality of conformity, well described in the passage quoted from *Light on the Path,* and in Mr. Judge's footnote to the sixth chapter of the *Gita.* Those who advocate

the morality of discovery do not *really* offend against the morality of conformity in any important way, unless, of course, as is sometimes the case, the morality of conformity has itself become irredeemably corrupt.

The corruption of the morality of conformity is brilliantly described by Dostoievsky in the chapter on the Grand Inquisitor in *The Brothers Karamazov.* As those who have read this very great novel know, Christ returns to sixteenth-century Spain, only to fall into the clutches of the Grand Inquisitor. At night, the Inquisitor visits Jesus in his dungeon cell, to reproach him and to tell him that he will burn him at the stake on the next day. To Jesus, he says:

> Hast Thou forgotten that to man rest and even death are preferable to a free choice between the knowledge of Good and Evil? Nothing seems more seductive in his eyes than freedom of conscience, and nothing proves more painful. And behold! instead of laying a firm foundation whereon to rest once for all man's conscience, Thou hast chosen to stir up in him all that is abnormal, mysterious, and indefinite, all that is beyond human strength. . . . Thou hast burdened man's soul with anxieties hitherto unknown to him. . . .

Now comes that incomparable exposition of conformist logic, of which the Inquisitor is past master. He tells Jesus:

> Under our rule and sway all will be happy, and will neither rebel nor destroy each other as they did while under Thy *free* banner. Oh, we will take good care to prove to them that they will become absolutely free only when they have abjured their freedom in our favour and submit to us absolutely. Thinkest Thou we shall be right or still lying? They will convince themselves of our rightness, for they will see what a depth of degrading slavery and strife that liberty of Thine has led them into. Liberty, Freedom of Thought and Conscience, and Science will lead them into such impassable chasms, place them face to face before such wonders and insoluble mysteries, that some of them—more rebellious and ferocious than the rest—will destroy each other; while the remainder, weak, helpless and miserable, will crawl back to our feet and cry: "Yes; right were ye, oh Fathers of Jesus; ye alone are in possession of His mystery, and we return to you, praying that ye save us from ourselves!" . . . .
>
> Until that day, they will never be happy. And who is it that helped most to blind them, tell me? Who separated the flock and scattered it over ways unknown if it be not Thee? But we will gather the sheep once more and subject them to our will forever. We will prove to them their own weakness and make them humble again, whilst with Thee they have learnt but pride, for Thou hast made more of them

than they ever were worth. We will give them that quiet, humble happiness, which alone benefits such weak, foolish creatures as they are, and having once had proved to them their weakness, they will become timid and obedient, and gather around us as chickens around their hen. . . . Yes, we will make them work like slaves, but during their recreation hours they shall have an innocent child-like life, full of play and merry laughter. We will even *permit them sin,* for, weak and helpless, they will feel the more love for us for permitting them to indulge in it. We will tell them that every kind of sin will be remitted to them, so long as it is done with our permission; that we take all these sins upon ourselves, for we so love the world, that we are even willng to sacrifice our souls for its satisfaction. And, appearing before them in the light of their scapegoats and redeemers, we shall be adored the more for it. . . .

What I now tell Thee will come to pass, and our kingdom shall be built, I tell thee, not later than tomorrow. Thou shalt see that obedient flock which at one simple motion of my hand will rush to add burning coals to Thy stake, one on which I will burn Thee for having dared to come and trouble us in our work. For, if ever was one who deserved more than any of the others our inquisitorial fires—it is Thee! *Tomorrow* I will burn Thee. *Dixi.*

The conflict between the two moralities is a historical reality which throws light on the degeneration of religion and the vicissitudes, through the centuries, of the Theosophical Movement, but it is also a psychological reality in the life of every human being, or will one day *become* such a reality for every man. The problem is to recognize and to deal with the conflict when it appears.

The conflict is inevitably a psychological reality by reason of the duality of the human mind. *Manas* reflects itself in matter—which in humans is the psychic nature—and this produces the polarity of psychological experience and affects all thinking about good and evil. Matter has an irresistible tendency to run to form; hence all thought of right and wrong at the psychic level results in rules of action, "codes" of morality. The higher morality is the morality of motive. Spiritual motives seek the fulfillment of the spiritual nature, which is to know and to unite. Psychic motives always seek a state of pleasurable feeling, which means, in relation to good and evil, a sense of virtue and righteousness. Psychic righteousness, being dependent on form, can be vindicated only by comparison with existing forms or standards—hence the necessary reign of conformity in determining the highest good for the psychic man. The psychic man inevitably feels virtue as *self-*

righteousness, since it is based upon comparison of oneself with others. Psychic virtues thus become a barrier to spiritual knowledge, because, so long as self-righteousness persists, self-forgetfulness is quite impossible. And for the psychically self-righteous, self-forgetfulness seems the dreadful abyss of non-existence. It is this horror which overtakes Arjuna, but which, through the vision permitted him by Krishna, he eventually overcomes. Arjuna comes to realize the full meaning of, as Krishna says in the eighteenth discourse, "That which in the beginning is as poison and in the end as the water of life."

The resolution of the conflict between the two moralities, however, is explained as early in the *Gita* as the third discourse, where Krishna declares:

> Even if the good of mankind only is considered by thee, the performance of thy duty will be plain; for whatever is practised by the most excellent men, that also is practised by others. The world follows whatever example they set. There is nothing, O son of Pritha, in the three regions of the universe which it is necessary for me to perform, nor anything possible to obtain which I have not obtained; and yet I am constantly in action. If I were not indefatigable in action, all men would presently follow my example, O son of Pritha. . . . O son of Bharata, as the ignorant perform the duties of life from the hope of reward, so the wise man, from the wish to bring the world to duty and to benefit mankind, should perform his actions without motives of interest. He should not create confusion in the understandings of the ignorant, who are inclined to outward works, but by being himself engaged in action should cause them to act also. . . . Those who have not this knowledge are interested in the actions thus brought about by the qualities; and he who is perfectly enlightened should not unsettle those whose discrimination is weak and knowledge incomplete, nor cause them to relax from their duty. . . . But the wise man also seeketh for that which is homogeneous with his own nature. All creatures act according to their natures; what, then, will restraint effect? In every purpose of the senses are fixed affection and dislike. A wise man should not fall in the power of these two passions, for they are the enemies of man. It is better to do one's own duty, even though it be devoid of excellence, than to perform another's duty well. It is better to perish in the performance of one's own duty; the duty of another is full of danger.

The great and true religions of the world are those which make plain the differing character of the two moralities, and invite, along with proper attention to useful convention, the morality of discovery.

# THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY: ITS MISSION AND ITS FUTURE

[AS EXPLAINED BY M. EMILE BURNOUF, THE FRENCH ORIENTALIST]

> It is another's fault if he be ungrateful; but it is mine if I do not give. To find one thankful man I will oblige many who are not.
>
> —SENECA.

> . . . . The veil is rent
> Which blinded me! I am as all these men
> Who cry upon their gods and are not heard,
> Or are not heeded—yet there must be aid!
> For them and me and all there must be help!
> Perchance the gods have need of help themselves,
> Being so feeble that when sad lips cry
> They cannot save! I would not let one cry
> Whom I could save! . . . .
>
> —THE LIGHT OF ASIA.

IT has seldom been the good fortune of the Theosophical Society to meet with such courteous and even sympathetic treatment as it has received at the hands of M. Emile Burnouf, the well-known Sanskritist, in an article in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* (July 15, 1888)—"*Le Bouddhisme en Occident.*"

Such an article proves that the Society has at last taken its rightful place in the thought-life of the XIXth century. It marks the dawn of a new era in its history, and, as such, deserves the most careful consideration of all those who are devoting their energies to its work. M. Burnouf's position in the world of Eastern scholarship entitles his opinions to respect; while his name, that of one of the first and most justly honoured of Sanskrit scholars (the late M. Eugène Burnouf), renders it more than probable that a man bearing such a name will make no hasty statements and draw no premature conclusions, but that his deductions will be founded on careful and accurate study.

His article is devoted to a triple subject: the origins of three religions or associations, whose fundamental doctrines M. Burnouf regards as identical, whose aim is the same, and which are derived from a common source. These are Buddhism, Christianity, and—the Theosophical Society. As he writes, page 341:

---

NOTE.—This editorial by H. P. Blavatsky stating the conditions upon which the success of the Theosophical Movement depends, first appeared in *Lucifer* for August, 1888, and was last reprinted in THEOSOPHY for April and May, 1942. It is here reprinted in full.

> This source, which is oriental, was hitherto contested; today it has been fully brought to light by scientific research, notably by the English scientists and the publication of original texts. Amongst these sagacious scrutinizers it is sufficient to name Sayce, Pool, Beal, Rhys-David, Spencer-Hardy, Bunsen. . . . It is a long time, indeed, since they were struck with resemblances, let us say, rather, identical elements, offered by the Christian religions, and that of Buddha. . . . During the last century these analogies were explained by a pretended Nestorian influence; but since then the Oriental chronology has been established, and it was shown that Buddha was anterior by several centuries to Nestorius, and even to Jesus Christ. . . . The problem remained an open one down to the recent day when the paths followed by Buddhism were recognized, and the stages traced on its way to finally reach Jerusalem. . . . And now we see born under our eyes a new association, created for the propagation in the world of the Buddhistic dogmas. It is of this triple subject that we shall treat.

It is on this, to a degree erroneous, conception of the aims and object of the Theosophical Society that M. Burnouf's article, and the remarks and opinions that ensue therefrom, are based. He strikes a false note from the beginning, and proceeds on this line. The T. S. was not created to propagate any dogma of any exoteric, ritualistic church, whether Buddhist, Brahmanical, or Christian. This idea is a widespread and general mistake; and that of the eminent Sanskritist is due to a self-evident source which misled him. M. Burnouf has read in the *Lotus,* the journal of the Theosophical Society of Paris, a polemical correspondence between one of the Editors of LUCIFER and the Abbé Roca. The latter persisting—very unwisely—in connecting theosophy with Papism and the Roman Catholic Church—which, of all the dogmatic religions, is the one his correspondent loathes the most—the philosophy and ethics of Gautama Buddha, not his later church, whether northern or southern, were therein prominently brought forward. The said Editor is undeniably a Buddhist—*i.e.,* a follower of the esoteric school of the great "Light of Asia," and so is the President of the Theosophical Society, Colonel H. S. Olcott. But this does not pin the theosophical body as a whole to ecclesiastical Buddhism. The Society was founded to become the Brotherhood of Humanity—a centre, philosophical and religious, common to all—not as a propaganda for Buddhism merely. Its first steps were directed toward the same great aim that M. Burnouf ascribes to Buddha Sakyamuni, who "opened his church to all men, without distinction of origin, caste, nation, colour, or sex," (*Vide* Art. I. in the *Rules* of the T. S.), adding,

"My law is a law of Grace for all." In the same way the Theosophical Society is open to all, without distinction of "origin, caste, nation, colour, or sex," and what is more—of creed. . . .

The introductory paragraphs of this article show how truly the author has grasped, with this exception, within the compass of a few lines, the idea that all religions have a common basis and spring from a single root. After devoting a few pages to Buddhism, the religion and the association of men founded by the Prince of Kapilavastu; to Manicheism, miscalled a "heresy," and its relation to both Buddhism and Christianity, he winds up his article with—the Theosophical Society. He leads up to the latter by tracing (*a*) the life of Buddha, too well known to an English speaking public through Sir Edwin Arnold's magnificent poem to need recapitulation; (*b*) by showing in a few brief words that Nirvana is *not annihilation;*[1] and (*c*) that the Greeks, Romans and even the Brahmans regarded the *priest* as the intermediary between men and God, an idea which involves the conception of a *personal God,* distributing his favours according to his own good pleasure—a sovereign of the universe, in short.

The few lines about Nirvana must find place here before the last proposition is discussed. Says the author:

> It is not my task here to discuss the nature of Nirvana. I will only say that the idea of annihilation is absolutely foreign to India, that the Buddha's object was to deliver humanity from the miseries of earth life and its successive reincarnations; that, finally, he passed his long existence in battling against Mara and his angels, whom he himself called Death and the army of death. The word *Nirvana* means, it is true, extinction, for instance, that of a lamp blown out; but it means also the absence of wind. I think, therefore, that Nirvana is nothing else but that *requies æterna,* that *lux perpetua* which Christians also desire for their dead.

With regard to the conception of the priestly office the author shows it entirely absent from Buddhism. Buddha is no God, but a *man* who has reached the supreme degree of wisdom and virtue. "Therefore Buddhist metaphysics conceives the absolute Principle of all things which other religions call God, in a totally different manner and does not make of it a being separate from the universe."

---

[1] The fact that Nirvana does *not* mean *annihilation* was repeatedly asserted in *Isis Unveiled,* where its author discussed its etymological meaning as given by Max Müller and others and showed that the "blowing out of a lamp" does not even imply the idea that Nirvana is the "extinction of consciousness." (See vol. i, p. 290 and vol ii, pp. 117, 286, 320, 566, etc.)

The writer then points out that the equality of all men among themselves is one of the fundamental conceptions of Buddhism.

He adds moreover and demonstrates that it was from Buddhism that the Jews derived their doctrine of a *Messiah.*

The Essenes, the Therapeuts and the Gnostics are identified as a result of this fusion of Indian and Semitic thought, and it is shown that, on comparing the lives of Jesus and Buddha, both biographies fall into two parts: the ideal legend and the real facts. Of these the legendary part is identical in both; as indeed must be the case from the theosophical standpoint, since both are based on the Initiatory cycle. Finally this "legendary" part is contrasted with the corresponding features in other religions, notably with the Vedic story of Visvakarman.[2] According to his view, it was only at the council of Nicea that Christianity broke officially with the ecclesiastical Buddhism, though he regards the Nicene Creed as simply the development of the formula: "the Buddha, the Law, the Church" (Buddha, Dharma, Sangha).

The Manicheans were originally *Samans* or Sramanas, Buddhist ascetics whose presence at Rome in the third century is recorded by St. Hyppolitus. M. Burnouf explains their dualism as referring to the double nature of man—good and evil—the evil principle being the *Mara* of Buddhist legend. He shows that the Manicheans derived their doctrines more immediately from Buddhism than did Christianity and consequently a life and death struggle arose between the two, when the Christian Church became a body which claimed to be the sole and exclusive possessor of Truth. This idea is in direct contradiction to the most fundamental conceptions of Buddhism and therefore its professors could not but be bitterly opposed to the Manicheans. It was thus the Jewish spirit of exclusiveness which armed against the Manicheans the secular arm of the Christian states.

Having thus traced the evolution of Buddhist thought from India to Palestine and Europe, M. Burnouf points out that the Albigenses on the one hand, and the Pauline school (whose influence is traceable in Protestantism) on the other, are the two latest survivals of this influence. He then continues—

---

[2] This identity between the *Logoi* of various religions and in particular the identity between the legends of Buddha and Jesus Christ, was again proven years ago in "Isis Unveiled," and the legend of Visvakarman more recently in the *Lotus* and other Theosophical publications. The whole story is analyzed at length in the "Secret Doctrine," in some chapters which were written more than two years ago.

> Analysis shows us in contemporary society two essential elements: the idea of a *personal God* among believers and, among the philosophers, the almost complete disappearance of charity. The Jewish element has regained the upper hand, and the Buddhistic element in Christianity has been obscured.
>
> Thus one of the most interesting, if not the most unexpected, phenomena of our day is the attempt which is now being made to revive and create in the world a new society, resting on the same foundations as Buddhism. Although only in its beginnings, its growth is so rapid that our readers will be glad to have their attention called to this subject. This society is still in some measure in the condition of a mission, and its spread is accomplished noiselessly and without violence. It has not even a definite name; its members grouping themselves under eastern names, placed as titles to their publications: *Isis, Lotus, Sphinx,* LUCIFER. The name common to all which predominates among them for the moment is that of *Theosophical Society.*

After giving a very accurate account of the formation and history of the Society—even to the number of its working branches in India, namely, 135—he then continues:

> The society is very young, nevertheless it has already its history. . . . It has neither money nor patrons; it acts solely with its own eventual resources. It contains no worldly element. It flatters no private or public interest. It has set itself a moral ideal of great elevation, it combats vice and egoism. It tends toward the unification of religions, which it considers as identical in their philosophical origin; but it recognizes the supremacy of truth only. . . .
>
> With these principles, and in the time in which we live, the society could hardly impose on itself more trying conditions of existence. Still it has grown with astonishing rapidity. . . .

Having summarized the history of the development of the T. S. and the growth of its organization, the writer asks: "What is the spirit which animates it?" To this he replies by quoting the three objects of the Society, remarking in reference to the second and third of these (the study of literatures, religions and sciences of the Aryan nations and the investigation of latent psychic faculties, etc.), that, although these might seem to give the Society a sort of academic colouring, remote from the affairs of actual life, yet in reality this is not the case; and he quotes the following passage from the close of the Editorial in LUCIFER for November, 1887:

> He who does not practice altruism; he who is not prepared to share his last morsel with a weaker or a poorer than himself; he who

> neglects to help his brother man, of whatever race, nation, or creed, whenever and wherever he meets suffering, and who turns a deaf ear to the cry of human misery; he who hears an innocent person slandered, whether a brother Theosophist or not, and does not undertake his defense as he would undertake his own—is no Theosophist.—(LUCIFER No. 3.)
>
> This declaration [continues M. Burnouf] is not Christian because it takes no account of belief, because it does not proselytise for any communion, and because, in fact, the Christians have usually made use of calumny against their adversaries, for example, the Manicheans, Protestants and Jews.[3] It is even less Mussulman or Brahminical. It is purely Buddhistic: the practical publications of the Society are either translations of Buddhist books, or original works inspired by the teaching of Buddha. Therefore the Society has a Buddhist character.
>
> Against this it protests a little, fearing to take on an exclusive and sectarian character. It is mistaken: the true and original Buddhism is not a sect, it is hardly a religion. It is rather a moral and intellectual reform, which excludes no belief, but adopts none. This is what is done by the Theosophical Society.

We have given our reasons for protesting. We are pinned to no faith.

In stating that the T. S. is "Buddhist," M. Burnouf is quite right, however, from one point of view. It has a Buddhist colouring simply because that religion, or rather philosophy, approaches more nearly to the TRUTH (the secret wisdom) than does any other exoteric form of belief. Hence the close connection between the two. But on the other hand the T. S. is perfectly right in protesting against being mistaken for a merely Buddhist propaganda, for the reasons given by us at the beginning of the present article, and by our critic himself. For although in complete agreement with him as to the *true* nature and character of primitive Buddhism, yet the Buddhism of today is none the less a rather dogmatic religion, split into many and heterogeneous sects. We follow the Buddha alone. Therefore, once it becomes necessary to go behind the actually existing form, and who will deny this necessity in respect to Buddhism?—once this is done, is it not infinitely better to go back to the pure and unadulterated source of Buddhism itself, rather than halt at an intermediate stage? Such a half and half

---

[3] And—the author forgets to add—"the Theosophists." No Society has ever been more ferociously calumniated and persecuted by the *odium theologicum* since the Christian Churches are reduced to use their tongues as their sole weapon—than the Theosophical Association and its Founders.—[ED.]

reform was tried when Protestantism broke away from the elder Church, and are the results satisfactory?

Such then is the simple and very natural reason why the T. S. does not raise the standard of exoteric Buddhism and proclaim itself a follower of the *Church* of the Lord Buddha. It desires too sincerely to remain with that *unadulterated* "light" to allow itself to be absorbed by its distorted shadow. This is well understood by M. Burnouf, since he expresses as much in the following passage:

> From the doctrinal point of creed, Buddhism has no mysteries; Buddha preached in parables; but a parable is a developed simile, and has nothing symbolical in it. The Theosophists have seen very clearly that, in religions, there have always been two teachings; the one very simple in appearance and full of images or fables which are put forward as realities; this is the public teaching, called exoteric. The other, esoteric or inner, reserved for the more educated and discreet adepts, the initiates of the second degree. There is, finally, a sort of science, which may formerly have been cultivated in the secrecy of the sanctuaries, a science called *hermetism,* which gives the final explanation of the symbols. When this science is applied to various religions, we see that their symbolisms, though in appearance different, yet rest upon the same stock of ideas, and are traceable to one single manner of interpreting nature.
>
> The characteristic feature of Buddhism is precisely the absence of this hermetism, the exiguity of its symbolism, and the fact that it presents to men, in their ordinary language, the truth without a veil. This it is which the Theosophical Society is repeating. . . ."

And no better model could the Society follow: but this is not all. It is true that no *mysteries* or esotericism exists in the two chief Buddhist Churches, the Southern and the Northern. Buddhists may well be content with the dead letter of Siddartha Buddha's teachings, as fortunately no higher or nobler ones in their effects upon the ethics of the masses exist, to this day. But herein lies the great mistake of all the Orientalists. There *is* an esoteric doctrine, a soul-ennobling philosophy, behind the outward body of ecclesiastical Buddhism. The latter, pure, chaste and immaculate as the virgin snow on the ice-capped crests of the Himalayan ranges, is, however, as cold and desolate as they with regard to the *post-mortem* condition of man. This secret system was taught to the *Arhats* alone, generally in the Saptaparna (Mahavansa's *Sattapani*) cave, known to Ta-hian as the *Chetu* cave near the Mount Baibhâr (in Pali Webhâra), in Rajagriha, the ancient capital of Maghada, by the Lord Buddha himself, between the hours

of *Dhyana* (or mystic contemplation). It is from this cave—called in the days of Sakyamuni, Saraswati or "Bamboo-cave"—that the Arhats initiated into the Secret Wisdom carried away their learning and knowledge beyond the Himalayan range, wherein the Secret Doctrine is taught to this day. Had not the South Indian invaders of Ceylon "heaped into piles as high as the top of the cocoanut trees" the *ollas* of the Buddhists, and burnt them, as the Christian conquerors burnt all the secret records of the Gnostics and the Initiates, Orientalists would have the proof of it, and there would have been no need of asserting now this well-known fact.

Having fallen into the common error, M. Burnouf continues:

> Many will say: It is a chimerical enterprise; it has no more a future before it than has the New Jerusalem of the Rue Thouin, and no more *raison d'être* than the Salvation Army. This may be so; it is to be observed, however, that these two groups of people are *Biblical Societies,* retaining all the paraphernalia of the expiring religions. The Theosophical Society is the direct opposite; it does away with figures, it neglects or relegates them to the background, putting in the foreground Science, as we understand it today, and the moral reformation, of which our old world stands in such need. What, then, are today the social elements which may be for or against it? I shall state them in all frankness.

In brief, M. Burnouf sees in the public *indifference* the first obstacle in the Society's way. "Indifference born from weariness; weariness of the inability of religions to improve social life, and the ceaseless spectacle of rites and ceremonies which the priest never explains." Men demand today "scientific formulæ stating laws of nature, whether physical or moral. . . ." And this indifference the Society must encounter; "its name, also, adding to its difficulties: for the word *Theosophy* has no meaning for the people, and, at best, a very vague one for the learned." "It seems to imply a personal god," M. Burnouf thinks, adding: "Whoever says personal god, says creation and miracle," and he concludes that "the Society would do better to become frankly Buddhist or to cease to exist."

With this advice of our friendly critic it is rather difficult to agree. He has evidently grasped the lofty ideal of primitive Buddhism, and rightly sees that this ideal is identical with that of the T. S. But he has not yet learned the lesson of its history, nor perceived that to graft a young and healthy shoot on to a branch which has lost—less than any

other, yet much of—its inner vitality, could not but be fatal to the new growth. The very essence of the position taken up by the T. S. is that it asserts and maintains the truth common to all religions; the truth which is true and undefiled by the concretions of ages of human passions and needs. But though Theosophy means Divine Wisdom, it implies nothing resembling belief in a personal god. It is *not* "the wisdom of God," but *divine* wisdom. The Theosophists of the Alexandrian Neo-Platonic school believed in "gods" and "demons" and in one *impersonal* ABSOLUTE DEITY. To continue:

> Our contemporary habits of life [says M. Burnouf] are not severe; they tend year by year to grow more gentle, but also more boneless. The moral stamina of the men of today is very feeble; the ideas of good and evil are not, perhaps, obscured, but the *will* to act rightly lacks energy. What men seek above all is pleasure and that somnolent state of existence called comfort. Try to preach the sacrifice of one's possessions and of oneself to men who have entered on this path of selfishness! You will not convert many. Do we not see the doctrine of the "struggle for life" applied to every function of human life? This formula has become for our contemporaries a sort of revelation, whose pontiffs they blindly follow and glorify. One may say to them, but in vain, that one must share one's last morsel of bread with the hungry; they will smile and reply by the formula: "the struggle for life." They will go further: they will say that in advancing a contrary theory, you are yourself struggling for your existence and are not disinterested. How can one escape from this sophism, of which all men are full today? . . .
>
> This doctrine is certainly the worst adversary of Theosophy, for it is the most perfect formula of egoism. It seems to be based on scientific observation, and it sums up the moral tendencies of our day. . . . Those who accept it and invoke justice are in contradiction with themselves; those who practice it and who put God on their side are blasphemers. But those who disregard it and preach charity are considered wanting in intelligence, their kindness of heart leading them into folly. If the T. S. succeeds in refuting this pretended law of the "struggle for life" and in extirpating it from men's minds, it will have done in our day a miracle greater than those of Sakyamouni and of Jesus.

And this miracle the Theosophical Society *will* perform. It will do this, not by disproving the relative existence of the law in question, but by assigning to it its due place in the harmonious order of the universe; by unveiling its true meaning and nature and by showing that this *pseudo* law is a "pretended" law indeed, as far as the human

family is concerned, and a fiction of the most dangerous kind. "Self-preservation," on these lines, is indeed and in truth a sure, if a slow, suicide, for it is a policy of mutual homicide, because men by descending to its practical application among themselves, merge more and more by a retrograde reinvolution into the animal kingdom. This is what the "struggle for life" is in reality, even on the purely materialistic lines of political economy. Once that this axiomatic truth is proved to all men; the same instinct of self-preservation only directed into its true channel will make them turn to *altruism*—as their surest policy of salvation.

It is just because the real founders of the Society have ever recognized the wisdom of truth embodied in one of the concluding paragraphs of M. Burnouf's excellent article, that they have provided against that terrible emergency in their fundamental teachings. The "struggle for existence" applies only to the physical, never to the moral plane of being. Therefore when the author warns us in these awfully truthful words:

> Universal charity will appear out of date; the rich will keep their wealth and will go on accumulating more; the poor will become impoverished in proportion, until the day when( propelled by hunger, they will demand bread, not of theosophy but of revolution. Theosophy shall be swept away by the hurricane. . . ."

The Theosophical Society replies: *"It surely will, were we to follow out his well-meaning advice, yet one which is concerned but with the lower plane."* It is not the policy of self-preservation, not the welfare of one or another personality in its finite and physical form that will or can ever secure the desired object and screen the Society from the effects of the social "hurricane" to come; but only the weakening of the feeling of separateness in the units which compose its chief element. And such a weakening can only be achieved by a process of *inner enlightenment.* It is not violence that can ever insure bread and comfort for all; nor is the kingdom of peace and love, of mutual help and charity and "food for all," to be conquered by a cold, reasoning, diplomatic policy. It is only by the close brotherly union of men's inner SELVES, of soul-solidarity, of the growth and development of that feeling which makes one suffer when one thinks of the suffering of others, that the reign of Justice and equality for all can ever be inaugurated. This is the first of the three fundamental objects for which the Theosophical Society was established, and called the "Universal Brotherhood of

Man," without distinction of *race, color or creed.*

When men will begin to realize that it is precisely that ferocious personal selfishness, the chief motor in the "struggle for life," that lies at the very bottom and is the one sole cause of human starvation; that it is that other—national egoism and vanity which stirs up the States and rich individuals to bury enormous capitals in the unproductive erection of gorgeous churches and temples and the support of a swarm of social drones called Cardinals and Bishops, the true parasites on the bodies of their subordinates and their flocks—that they will try to remedy this universal evil by a healthy change of policy. And this salutary revolution can be *peacefully* accomplished only by the Theosophical Society and its teachings.

This is little understood by M. Burnouf, it seems, since while striking the true key-note of the situation elsewhere he ends by saying:

> The Society will find allies, if it knows how to take its place in the civilized world today. Since it will have against it all the positive cults, with the exception perhaps of a few dissenters and bold priests, the only other course open to it is to place itself in accord with the men of science. If its dogma of charity is a complementary doctrine which it furnishes to science, the society will be obliged to establish it on scientific data, under pain of remaining in the regions of sentimentality. The oft-repeated formula of the struggle for life is true, but not universal; it is true for the plants; it is less true for the animals in proportion as we climb the steps of the ladder, for the law of sacrifice is seen to appear and to grow in importance; in man, these two laws counter-balance one another, and the law of sacrifice, which is that of charity, tends to assume the upper hand, through the empire of the reason. It is reason which, in our societies, is the source of right, of justice, and of charity; through it we escape the inevitableness of the struggle for life, moral slavery, egoism and barbarism, in one word, that we escape from what Sakyamouni poetically called the power and the army of Mara.

And yet our critic does not seem satisfied with this state of things but advises us by adding as follows:

> If the Theosophical Society [he says] enters into this order of ideas and knows how to make them its fulcrum, it will quit the limbus of inchoate thought and will find its place in the modern world; remaining none the less faithful to its Indian origin and to its principles. It may find allies; for if men are weary of the symbolical cults, unintelligible to their own teachers, yet men of heart (and they are many) are weary also and terrified at the egoism and the corruption, which tend to engulf our civilization and to replace

> it by a learned barbarism. Pure Buddhism possesses all the breadth that can be claimed from a doctrine at once religious and scientific. Its tolerance is the cause why it can excite the jealousy of none. At bottom, it is but the proclamation of the supremacy of reason and of its empire over the animal instincts, of which it is the regulator and the restrainer. Finally it has itself summed up its character in two words which admirably formulate the law of humanity, science and virtue.

And this formula the society has expanded by adopting that still more admirable axiom: *"There is no religion higher than truth."*

At this juncture we shall take leave of our learned, and perhaps, too kind critic, to address a few words to Theosophists in general.

* * * * *

Has our Society, as a whole, deserved the flattering words and notice bestowed upon it by M. Burnouf? How many of its individual members, how many of its branches, have carried out the precepts contained in the noble words of a Master of Wisdom, as quoted by our author from No. 3 of LUCIFER? "He who does not practice" this and the other *"is no Theosophist,"* says the quotation. Nevertheless, those who have never shared even their superfluous—let alone their last morsel—with the poor; those who continue to make a difference in their hearts between a coloured and a white brother; as all those to whom malicious remarks against their neighbors, uncharitable gossip and even slander under the slightest provocation, are like heavenly dew on their parched lips—call and regard themselves as *Theosophists!*

It is certainly not the fault of the minority of *true* Theosophists, who do try to follow *the path* and who make desperate efforts to reach it, if the majority of their fellow members do not. It is not to them therefore that this is addressed, but to those who, in their fierce love of Self and their vanity, instead of trying to carry out the original programme to the best of their ability, sow broadcast among the members the seeds of dissension; to those whose personal vanity, discontentment and love of power, often ending in ostentation, give the lie to the original programme and to the Society's motto.

Indeed, these original aims of the FIRST SECTION of the Theosophical Society under whose advice and guidance the second and third merged into one were first founded, can never be too often recalled to the minds

of our members.[4] The Spirit of these aims is clearly embodied in a letter from one of the Masters quoted in the "Occult World," on pages 71 and 73. Those Theosophists then,—who in the course of time and events would, or have, departed from those original aims, and instead of complying with them have suggested new policies of administration from the depths of their inner consciousness, *are not true to their pledges.*

"But we have always worked on the lines originally traced to us" —some of them proudly assert.

"You have not" comes the reply from those who know more of the true Founders of the T. S. *behind the scenes* than they do—or ever will if they go on working in this mood of Self-illusion and self-sufficiency.

What are the lines traced by the "Masters"? Listen to the authentic words written by one of them in 1880 to the author of the "Occult World":

> . . . "To our minds these motives sincere and worthy of every serious consideration *from the worldly standpoint,* appear *selfish.* . . . They are selfish, because you must be aware that the chief object of the Theosophical Society is *not so much to gratify individual aspirations as to serve our fellow men* . . . and in our view the highest aspirations for the welfare of humanity become tainted with selfishness, if in the mind of the philanthropist, there lurks the shadow of a desire *for self-benefit, or a tendency to do injustice even there where these exist unconsciously to himself.* Yet, you have ever discussed, but to put down, the idea of a Universal Brotherhood, questioned its usefulness, and advised to remodel the Theosophical Society on the principle of a college for the special study of occultism. . . ." —(*"Occult World,"* p. 72.)

But another letter was written, also in 1880, which is not only a direct reproof to the Theosophists who neglect the main idea of Brotherhood, but also an anticipated answer to M. Emile Burnouf's chief argument. Here are a few extracts from it. It was addressed again to those who sought to make away with the "sentimental title," and make of the Society but an arena for "cup-growing and astral bell-ringing":

> . . . In view of the ever-increasing triumph and, at the same time, misuse of free thought and liberty, how is the combative natural instinct of man to be restrained from inflicting hitherto unheard-of cruelties, enormities, tyranny, injustice, if not through the soothing

[4] *Vide* Rules in the 1st vol. of the "Theosophist," pp. 179 and 180.

influence of a Brotherhood, and of the practical application of Buddha's esoteric doctrines? . . . Buddhism is the surest path to lead men towards the one esoteric truth. As we find the world now, whether Christian, Mussulman, or Pagan, justice is disregarded and honour and mercy both flung to the winds. In a word, how, since that the main objects of the Theosophical Society are misinterpreted by those who are most willing to serve us personally, are we to deal with the rest of mankind, with that curse known as 'the struggle for life,' which is the real and most prolific parent of most woes and sorrows, and all crimes? Why has that struggle become the almost universal scheme of the universe? We answer: because no religion, with the exception of Buddhism, has hitherto taught a practical contempt for this earthly life, while each of them, always with that one solitary exception, has through its hells and damnations inculcated the greatest dread of death. Therefore do we find that 'struggle for life' raging most fiercely in Christian countries, most prevalent in Europe and America. It weakens in pagan lands, and is nearly unknown among Buddhist populations. . . . Teach the people to see that life on this earth, even the happiest, is but a burden and an illusion, that it is but our own Karma, the cause producing the effect, that is our own judge, our saviour in future lives—and the great struggle for life will soon lose its intensity. . . . The world in general and Christendom especially left for two thousand years to the regime of a personal God, as well as its political and social systems based on that idea, has now proved a failure. If Theosophists say: 'We have nothing to do with all this, the lower classes and inferior races [those of India for instance, in the conception of the British] cannot concern us and must manage as they can,' what becomes of our fine professions of benevolence, reform, etc.? Are these professions a mockery? and, if a mockery, can ours be the true path? . . . Should we devote ourselves to teaching a few Europeans, fed on the fat of the land, many of them loaded with the gifts of blind fortune, the rationale of bell-ringing, cup-growing, spiritual telephone, etc., etc., and leave the teeming millions of the ignorant, of the poor and the despised, the lowly and the oppressed, to take care of themselves, and of their hereafter, the best they know how? Never! Perish rather the Theosophical Society . . . than that we should permit it to become no better than an academy of magic and a hall of Occultism. That we, the devoted followers of the spirit incarnate of absolute self-sacrifice, of philanthropy and divine kindness as of all the highest virtues attainable on this earth of sorrow, the man of men, Gautama Buddha, should ever allow the Theosophical Society to represent the embodiment of selfishness, to become the refuge of the few with no thought in them for the many, is a strange idea. . . . And it is we, the humble disciples of the perfect Lamas, who are expected to permit the Theosophical Society to drop its noblest

title, that of the Brotherhood of Humanity, to become a simple school of Psychology. No! No! our brothers, you have been labouring under the mistake too long already. Let us understand each other. He who does not feel competent enough to grasp the noble idea sufficiently to work for it, need not undertake a task too heavy for him. . . .

"To be true, religion and philosophy must offer the solution of every problem. That the world is in such a bad condition morally is a conclusive evidence that none of its religions and philosophies—those of the civilized races less than any other—have ever possessed the TRUTH. The right and logical explanations on the subject of the problems of the great dual principles, right and wrong, good and evil, liberty and despotism, pain and pleasure, egotism and altruism, are as impossible to them now as they were 1880 years ago. They are as far from the solution as they ever were, but. . . .

"To these there must be somewhere a consistent solution, and if our doctrines will show their competence to offer it, then the world will be the first to confess, that ours must be the true philosophy, the true religion, the true light, which gives truth and nothing but the TRUTH. . . ."

And this TRUTH is not Buddhism, but esoteric BUDHISM. "He that hath ears to hear, let him hear. . . ."

---

## A DREAM FULFILLED

As in the old society the generous, the just, the tender-hearted had been placed at a disadvantage by the possession of those qualities, so in the new society the cold-hearted, the greedy, and self-seeking found themselves out of joint with the world. Now that the conditions of life for the first time ceased to operate as a forcing process to develop the brutal qualities of human nature, and the premium which had heretofore encouraged selfishness was not only removed, but placed upon unselfishness, it was for the first time possible to see what unperverted human nature really was like. The depraved tendencies, which had previously overgrown and obscured the better to so large extent, now withered like cellar fungi in the open air, and the nobler qualities showed a sudden luxuriance which turned cynics into panegyrists and for the first time in human history tempted mankind to fall in love with itself. Soon was fully revealed, what the divines and philosophers of the old world never would have believed, that human nature in its essential qualities is good, not bad.

—EDWARD BELLAMY

# NOTES ON THE TAO TE KING

IT is interesting to ponder Lao Tzu's praise of meekness and humility in relation to the general stage of manasic development represented by what we now call the "ancient world." According to William Q. Judge, in one of his well-remembered *Path* editorials, it was once natural for mankind to be governed according to the hierarchical principle of guidance. First, according to the oldest of legends referred to in *The Secret Doctrine,* there were "divine instructors" who taught an infant humanity certain basic ideas, and implemented them with a measure of art and science. A parallel between the early stages of manasic evolution for the human race as a whole and the parent's guidance and stewardship of a child is obvious, and it appears that the original philosophic conceptions underlying acceptance of a *natural* caste system of India reflect recognition of the appropriateness of the "guidance" principle.

During this long cycle—though one can hardly see just when it ends, for the majority of men—the sages taught that men would gradually develop their own powers most effectively by following the guiding light of duty, according to karmic placement. And since a virtual infinitude of time exists for the evolutionary progress of the individual, every effort should be made to discourage ambition—for ambition leads to haste, and to the assumption of responsibilities which are not commensurate with capacity. However, the particular article by Mr. Judge, to which we refer, indicates that a new hour has *now* finally struck, and the time for self-reliance arrived. No longer do the old religious forms and traditions provide adequate guidance, for man must now learn to guide himself. The child has become a man, and must learn to bear a man's responsibilities.

Much of the puzzlement occasioned by Lao Tzu's strong emphasis on the value of preserving public ignorance regarding cultural and governmental matters may be explained by speculation on the amount of time needed for the transition to which Mr. Judge refers. It is no longer appropriate for us to believe in "the values of ignorance," for the turn of the cycle of manasic development has made literacy universal and some form of participation in government the order of the day. When Lao Tzu says that the "sage's constant object is to keep

the people without knowledge and without desire, or to prevent those who have knowledge from daring to act," he is, perhaps, attempting to contribute to the welfare of the people by insuring against the assumption of too much responsibility too soon. However, Lao Tzu is also apparently aware of the need for a transition, and this is indicated by the suggestion, in the following paragraph, that gentleness and non-interference in government will eventually make it possible for individuals to take their own initiative in a wise manner. And as Lin Yutang's rendition of the *Tao Te King* puts it, "when the task of the best rulers is accomplished, their work done, the people all remark, 'we have done it ourselves'." With this introduction, then, we turn to two of the "puzzling" verses on government in the *Tao Te King*:

> The greater the number of laws and enactments, the more thieves and robbers there will be. Therefore the Sage says: "So long as I do nothing, the people will work out their own reformation. So long as I love calm, the people will right themselves. If only I keep from meddling, the people will grow rich. If only I am free from desire, the people will come naturally back to simplicity."
>
> If the government is sluggish and tolerant, the people will be honest and free from guile. If the government is prying and meddling, there will be constant infraction of the law. Is the government corrupt? Then uprightness becomes rare, and goodness becomes strange. Verily, mankind have been under delusion for many a day!

Lao Tzu is here referring to the results of too much interference on the part of government in the past. But it appears to be his belief that the people must return to simplicity before they will be ready for intelligent self-reliance. Other verses read as follows:

> In the highest antiquity, the people did not know that they had rulers. In the next age they loved and praised them. In the next, they feared them. In the next they despised them.
>
> How cautious is the Sage, how sparing of his words! When his task is accomplished and affairs are prosperous, the people all say: "We have come to be as we are, naturally and of ourselves."
>
> If any one desires to take the Empire in hand and govern it, I see that he will not succeed. The Empire is a divine utensil which may not be roughly handled. He who meddles, mars. He who holds it by force, loses it.

Lao Tzu is basically calling for a reformation in the attitudes of those who govern the empire. The reformation must be guided without ambition, and needs an awareness of the slow, organic growth required

of a balanced society, plus a willingness to leave opportunity for those who have *natural* ability to assume gradually further responsibilities.

An introduction to a chapter on "government" is provided by the last paragraph in the preceding chapter of the *Tao Te King*:

> The best soldiers are not warlike; the best fighters do not lose their temper. The greatest conquerors are those who overcome their enemies without strife. The greatest directors of men are those who yield place to others. This is called the Virtue of not striving, the capacity for directing mankind; this is being the compeer of Heaven. It was the highest goal of the ancients.

The complicated psychology of this passage is explained by a conversation said to have taken place with Lao Tzu on the subject of "the best ruler":

> "Suppose there is a man here," asked Yang Tsechu (Yangtse) of Laotse, "who is strong and determined, who has insight and understanding of things and events, and follows Tao diligently. Shall such a one be comparable to a wise ruler?"
>
> "In comparison to the Sage, such a man is like a good clerk or a technical expert, who knows how to worry and to bustle about," said Laotse. "The proverb says, 'tigers and leopards are hunted for their skins, the ape is captured for his agility, and the hound is put under leash because of his ability to worry foxes.' How can such a person be compared to a wise ruler?"
>
> Yangtse knitted his brows and said, "Can you enlighten me on the kind of government by the wise ruler?"
>
> "In the government by the best ruler," said Laotse, "its effect is over the entire nation, yet it appears not to stem from him. He changes and influences all things, and the people are not dependent on him. His influence is there, but you cannot put your finger on it, and everybody is pleased with himself. (The ruler) is one who stands on the fathomless and roams in the sphere of non-being."

While Jesus taught in parables and counselled humility—"the meek shall inherit the earth"—Lao Tzu taught an implicit metaphysics regarding human evolution. And the implicit metaphysics became explicit in the assertion that man's original nature was unspoiled: Man was taught, too soon, Lao Tzu holds, a knowledge of virtue and vice by philosophers and governments—so it is Lao Tzu's contention that when virtues become *consciously* considered and praised too soon in the evolutionary cycle, hypocrisy develops, and from hypocrisy runs a straight highroad to moral chaos.

Without an understanding of the essential affirmative doctrines undoubtedly known by Lao Tzu, the Westerner may tend to prefer Confucius, who tries to work out a "system" capable of producing the proper rituals to establish the proper virtues. But when men do too much talking about the virtues which should be practiced, the leaders of men, as one early devotee of Lao Tzu put it, "resort to devices to induce them to do good, and it becomes possible for one man to decide and impose on the world what it regards as desirable."

Medieval Christianity was, certainly, a fulfillment of this prediction, whereas the great revolutionary movements have always sprung from those who saw beyond the strictures of an older morality, and expressed a *broader* perception of ethics. Again, we see the kinship of great teachers in their desire to show a way which leads beyond the restrictions of contemporary tradition, but which, at the same time, requires a much greater expenditure of energy by way of *self*-discipline. It seems that an eager and still somewhat youthful human race is always trying to outstrip itself, to do too much too soon. While the cycle, today, is not the cycle referred to in the *Tao Te King,* many of the points of emphasis made by Lao Tzu are obviously applicable—and to a goodly number of us.

Prof. R. B. Blakney, in a commentary on his new rendering of the *Tao Te King,* finds the keynote of Lao Tzu's philosophy in recognition of the pressing need to avoid "waste motion." It is for this reason, also, Prof. Blakney points out, that the verses of the *Tao Te King* use "great economy of language, an economy like that of lightning in the night." He continues:

> The Virtue of power of the Way is illustrated by an assertion of the consequences of letting the Way be the way by which the affairs of men are dispatched. This is the radical element in the poems. Reality, the Way, is taken with great seriousness. Why should men interfere with its operations? It would be much better if, from the king down to the least peasant, the wills of men should be held subject to the Way, so that like all else in the universe, men should become its perfect instruments. Let be! Then the mighty Way will act through you and its power will accomplish what you cannot do of your own volition.
>
> Does all the plotting and planning, the fetching and carrying, the making and unmaking which comprise the life of the world make for good?

# PRINCIPLES IN DAILY LIFE

OVER and over we hear statements which have become almost automatic with Theosophists, statements which seem lofty, yet which we are sometimes content merely to repeat. Among such, we find: "Live the life if you would know the doctrine." "The ethics of Theosophy are of highest importance." "To live to benefit mankind is the first step, to practice the six glorious virtues is the second."

There can be no more universal theme than that which is embodied in this statement of the United Lodge of Theosophists: "It regards as Theosophists all who are engaged in the true service of Humanity, without distinction of race, creed, sex, condition or organization." And to level further the barriers between men, the platform of the United Lodge of Theosophists declares that the "cause of Theosophy" is greater than any theosophical organization. This is seen in the opening sentence of the ULT Declaration: "The policy of this Lodge is independent devotion to the cause of Theosophy, without professing attachment to any Theosophical organization." The "Cause" of Theosophy is surely to establish a nucleus of universal brotherhood. So we are thrown back on a way of living. When it comes to the decisions of daily life, we are to find again those principles of action which lead to real brotherhood.

In any deep relationship which is to become truly brotherly, we strive to see as much of truth as we possibly can. In the situations that come up every hour and every minute, we need to take a view that "sees all around" every incident. As H.P.B. points out in *The Key to Theosophy,* justice is the only real mercy. Yet how rarely we feel able to see a whole situation! If, realizing our partial view, we hesitate in our action, our action then lacks the full strength of what Gandhi might have called "Soul-Force." An alert admission that we may be wrong forestalls a conflict of pride, yet does not make us right.

Let us start from those little moments in a small family circle. Johnny comes crying to Mother. His finger is hurt; and, of course, "Billy did it." Mother quickly puts together several factors: Billy is older and has greater responsibility to be careful; Johnny is younger and needs greater protection; in the past, Mother has seen Billy teasing Johnny. And out of this meager evidence, a human judgment is formed. But the doctrines of Theosophy may appeal for consideration. The mother may then explain that of course she may be wrong in this particular

case. The important thing is, however, that justice does not depend on any particular *action*. Something in Johnny attracted an action from Billy, and something in Billy attracted a penalty from Mother. Only each one can know what was wrong or unbrotherly in his own heart. All that we can be sure of is that somewhere there was an inharmonious thought and action. Only as each one studies his own heart can causes be corrected. The small seed in one's heart is not visible to others while it is small. If it is allowed to grow, in time it will be as visible as a giant oak. If the tree is good, it is because the seed was good. If, as we grow older, we develop a disagreeable and prickly nature, it will be quite evident that in our hearts were seeds of resentment and pride and self-righteousness.

Now, in this minor situation, the attempt was made to make up for a partial view and the resulting possibility of injustice. For only justice is mercy. The feeling of injustice is one of the most powerful motors of violence known. Probably the only help we have toward establishing "a courageous endurance of personal injustice" is a grasp of universal law, a conviction that our own must come home to us. In every event we must learn to see the correction of some defect in our nature, or an opportunity to solidify a good tendency. We may have a less partial view of our character and situation if we realize that we should not only scrutinize the causes in our hearts, now, but also recognize that these causes may have had a long growth in former lives, and may have become so deeply rooted that we are no longer aware of them. They have become so much a part of ourselves that we cannot see them at all.

For many reasons, it is easier for the individual to see the whole situation in the small setting of the home than in a larger group involving many people. Even in the home, we note how hard it is to judge rightly. Even when it is obviously our duty to judge, we are not clairvoyant enough to know the whole story, inside and out. Beyond this, our own prejudices and emotions often get in the way in our execution of justice. If there is pride or vindictiveness in a parent's settlement of a quarrel, the seed of future inharmony is planted. Also, the emotions of the contenders cloud everyone's view. Impatience, a willingness to take offense, defense of one's self, general frustration—all these impede the course of calm and harmonious adjustment.

How then can any individual expect apparent or outer justice-of-the-moment from any group, local, national, or racial? Our reliance on

law, on brotherhood, on truth, must be far deeper than any of the surface reactions we receive from our fellow man. We, ourselves, return to other beings only a small fraction of their total Karma, because we see only a small fraction of that human being, and can respond only in terms of that. The Buddhas of compassion can be all things to all men, because they *see* more. They are therefore able to react to the highest plane of other beings, a plane which we hide from our own view by our separative and unbrotherly habits of mind.

Let us think of the complications of claim and counter-claim at Suez or Kashmir, or wherever there is conflict. The habit of mind is to say: "Here are the clear-cut issues. We are right; they are wrong." The same is true among religionists: "There is only one truth, and we have it; you don't." Yet freedom to follow what seems to be true must be accorded to all; for if pride is the last citadel, the great bulwark of separation, the great cause of conflict and war, then the antidote to it must be constantly applied in the simplest situations as well as in those most involved. Otherwise it stands against brotherhood and truth. We tend to say: "The truth is *this*. But I can't afford to admit it. People would not forgive me or believe me again." But this is the voice of self-preservation speaking. It is the voice of a little boy afraid to tell the truth, afraid of a spanking, Yet, the strange fact is that when the "boys" of the world admit the truth, the spanking is not so fearsome as expected.

Intolerance in religion, in politics, in personality, is an aspect of pride and self-righteousness. It is a surface view; and H.P.B. was adept at pricking the balloons of false self-esteem in these various fields. Whenever a religious claimant said, "This happened just once—in *our* religion," H.P.B. pointed out that it had happened many times. Almost, the refrain of the teaching seems to be: "Don't think you're so smart." For—

> If Sun thou cans't not be, then be the humble planet.
>
> Be humble, if thou wouldst attain to Wisdom. Be humbler still, when Wisdom thou hast mastered.
>
> Self-gratulation, O Disciple, is like unto a lofty tower, up which a haughty fool has climbed. Thereon he sits in prideful solitude and unperceived by any but himself.

The cause of Theosophy is not served by claiming that Theosophy as it is recorded is *all* the truth, nor that it is the only record of the truth. It is a fragment torn from the *pavement* of truth. If we claim that we

have the whole pavement, we are doing the exact, exclusively proud thing that nations and religions have done in the past, in perpetuating cleavage and self-righteousness. What every Theosophist can reasonably say is: "I have learned many truths from Theosophy. There is still a great deal which I haven't gained, which is waiting for me." Theosophy teaches that all religion and science and philosophy contain much of truth. Theosophy gives a key of basic and universal ideas. Once you are familiar with that key, it helps you to unlock the universal, true meaning in every religion or science, or in any other subject. This key, then, can give men greater tolerance, greater understanding, more common ground for brotherhood. Its only value is in use. It is not some exclusive possession by which Theosophists can claim to be better than others; rather, this key is a tool for unlocking men's minds and hearts. Whoever you are, scientist, religionist, skeptic—tell us the truth you live by, and let us tell you ours. Together, let us rejoice in the truth we have and acknowledge our personal limitations.

There is a universe of knowledge to be had. Each rises to his own possibilities. How ridiculous to praise or blame anyone for "knowing" more or less! There is limitless skill to be acquired in doing the right thing in the right way at the right time. Who can boast of where he stands? By seeing where we are deficient, we see a place to move forward, and thus prevent the barriers of pride from growing.

---

## Knowledge vs Belief

Those "against science," while using applied science every day of their lives, held on to their ignorance as stubbornly as they held on to God. In a most interesting and completely human way, God and ignorance are twisted together, even now, in millions of people's minds and feelings. Many sincerely do not want to "give up" God. But there is something in that ignorance which they don't want to give up, either. It is, I think, a spurious sense of goodness. If only we can keep ourselves ignorant enough we can worship God and feel good while doing harm to others and to ourselves. This way, sanctity can be purchased at cut rates. And we have always loved a bargain, especially when we cheat ourselves. The ego learns this early, and is marvelously adept at using ignorance as a shield to protect us from the impact of our ideals.

—Lillian Smith

# THE ROOT OF BEING

WHO has not sought to know—at one time or another—the answer to that most perplexing of queries, "When did I first become?" Must it remain, forever, the absolute ultimate of human questions? Or can one at least partially fathom the problem of beginning, in so far as individualized conscious awareness of Self is concerned, or must one remain statically content with the sole fact that one *does* exist? For those who seek only to know that which can be rationally understood, is it enough to say with authoritative finality, "This much you may know of life, but inquire no further of its mysteries." But in contradistinction to any such barrier to thinking, Theosophy answers," Knowledge *is* available, but each one must search out the Eternal Truth for himself."

"Theosophy endeavors to present to man what his real nature is: that he is first, last, and all the time Spirit. Spirit means Life and Consciousness—the *power* to see, to know, to experience. We all have that. That is common to all of us. It is not separate in itself—it is the One Life in all beings of every grade." These sentences, taken from "The Language of the Soul," in *The Friendly Philosopher,* present the fundamental basis of the First Proposition of *The Secret Doctrine.* Having first assimilated this stepping stone to understanding, one can then proceed to greater clarification of ideas leading to knowledge.

Expanding on the idea, Mr. Crosbie continues: "But we, as individuals, have evolved into individuals from the great Ocean of Life. We are Individualized Spirit, and so we each have a separate individual existence, which is continuous. In that sense we are an evolution, but an evolution of Spirit, not Matter—an evolution of Knowledge, not of form only. This has been obtained through observation and experience; whatever differences exist are because of more or less experience, or a better adaptation and application of it; there is no difference in the Source or Potentialities of any being."

This passage expresses succinctly what may to some students of Theosophy appear very difficult to grasp. For although the Teaching plainly is that "separateness" is only a relative truth, yet, withal, as Mr. Crosbie puts it, "we, as individuals, have evolved into individuals" becoming thereby fully "individualized" with all the powers of the Godhead capable of development. Substantially, this premise suggests

that while separateness is an illusion, each individualized human being has evolved for himself a coherent and comprehensive set of values that spells out "personality."

Following through on this idea, one can readily understand that the personality is "the field" in which the Ego works. And as, in conjunction with all other egos, in one life we sow and in another we reap—albeit technically Karma is mixed and of many kinds and on all levels, as determined by the actions of the Perceiver—there must have been a time, however remote, when the individualized unit represented by human awareness began sowing and reaping.

Assuredly, Man never had simply one "beginning," for the Real Man is none of his principles, nor all of them. He is THAT. But to account for the vagaries of humankind there must be a "first" of some kind to explain the differences. And so we must accept the hypothesis of an *evolving* human awareness, *i.e.,* "the acquirement of individuality."

---

## GROWTH OF AWARENESS

I venture to say that if ever we bring ourselves to make the final choices, we shall discover that they are very simple ones—the image of a landscape that speaks of all the possibilities of freedom; the possession of a love that is all-consuming; the ripening knowledge of what a great poem is saying; the daily revelations of a work of art; the full possession of a disciplined mind; the words of a philosopher that never diminish in their power to help us; the music that does not diminish in its power to move us; the infinite satisfactions of a great religious belief; a noble friendship; a wholly unselfish way of life. But it must be remembered that all these are choices which when we have made them have ruled out the many other possibilities; and it is therefore incumbent upon us to select with the greatest care, lest through ignorance we let the prizes slip through our fingers.

—WELLER EMBLER

# YOUTH-COMPANIONS ASK— AND ANSWER

*SURELY all children need disciplining at times. What kind of punishment is there which is effective and yet which can be sanctioned theosophically?*

(*b*) Obviously, one purpose of the discipline or punishment situation undertaken by the adults is to stop an undesirable activity. Simultaneously, however, the opportunity exists to make this, as well as every life-situation, an occasion of education and insight for the child, thus enabling him to gain some realization of the reasons for its unacceptability and to discover, perhaps, how he may modify his behavior in the future.

If we consider that the deterring situation should also be one of education, punishment has no place. Although the material ends of both "conditioning-discipline" and "shock-punishment" may be the same, their effects are quite different. These effects are primarily determined by the psychological pressures implicit in the discipline or punishment situation. All human action involves goal-seeking activity, whether it be a desire to help all of humanity, to become a happier individual, or simply to satisfy hunger. Thus, the more direction and purpose the child perceives in what the adult asks of him, the easier it will be to understand and follow directions. Disciplining by way of educative activity gives a direction to the child's action, but punishment is only informative in that it tells the child what not to do.

Punishment may not produce any change in the individual's basic attitudes; it may only demonstrate that one particular kind of behavior is unacceptable, with the result that other equally unacceptable behavior is substituted. The side-effects of punishment may result in emotional upset and internalized antagonism toward others. Conversely, reward, whether it be affection and praise or a feeling of being wanted, tends to reinforce the child's conception of an essentially helpful and beneficent world. The situation is a positive one in that it does not create doubt as to what is required. The adult is more readily able to demonstrate consistency in his demands.

Although a reward of itself may produce the desired action by the child, it may well be considered a bribe if it is arbitrarily related to the

task being performed. The particular reward, if of a tangible nature, may foster an attitude of self-interest and become an end-in-itself for the child. However, if the adult's responses to the child embody a communication of value and outlook, and a respect for the child for his own sake, he begins to internalize the originally externally imposed goals, to the point that he becomes a self-regulating individual. In effect, then, the goal of discipline should be the removal of artificially imposed barriers on the child's judgment.

Firm, kind "discipline" is sanctioned by the psychoanalyst, the sociologist, and the psychologist. Too often we may adopt an attitude toward life-situations and feel it to be distinctly and wonderfully theosophical—and impossible to arrive at from another philosophical basis. It seems rather that the real value of theosophical philosophy lies in certain basic optimistic concepts of the nature of man and the rest of the universe, but *some* of these may be found, as well, in other philosophical and religious systems. Once these concepts are valued, the individual can take the existing world of knowledge, and make it live and work for himself. Whether we think of a concept as theosophical, scientific, or religious is not so important; the real test lies in whether it checks out with the perceived reality around us, i.e., is it *true?* If it is, then to the degree that we internalize its concepts, it will make us more fruitful and effective individuals, and will also benefit all those who contact us in our daily rounds.

*People tend to consider the fields of entertainment and relaxation amoral—mysteriously outside the necessity for careful and constant scrutiny. Yet the* Bhagavad-Gita *says, "Every action without exception is comprehended in spiritual knowledge." How can one deal in moral terms with these areas?*

(*a*) The study of philosophy is the search for consistency, as it is the search for the basic ethic. Given either sanctity or self-determined value, the ethic assumes the role of morality.

One of the strongest criticisms which may be hurled at "rational man" is the accusation that the life he lives is an inconsistent one. Yet, any effort to pinpoint the reasons for his attempted consistency ends in puzzlement. What possible eternal justification is there for the demand that man must live an ordered life with underlying principles perceived as structuring succeeding actions? Yet man continues to philosophize, just as he continues to search for the primary laws governing the world

in which he lives. He assumes that law exists and that therefore he must find it. Possibly, also, he assumes unconsciously (the philosophizing man, at least) that there should be balance in his own actions—"luck" plays no real part in his life; the forces that masquerade as "the fates" are to be uncovered.

In theory, then, the consistent life, pursued according to principles, is the desirable life; it is the life of the exalted man. Does such a man know the need for entertainment and relaxation? His actions can be the concerted effort of his whole being. His life can be consistent if he has evaluated his goals and gains full enjoyment from the pursuit of them. Whatever the area of activity engaged in, he is "productive" and at the same time "free from anxiety." He knows no sharp distinctions between what is termed work and what is termed entertainment. His whole life might be called one of entertainment and relaxation. Yet his daily actions need not be one-sided; rather they complement each other as the individual is able to experience and correlate more fully from even the most commonplace of human activities.

One logical conclusion seems to be, then, that entertainment for its own sake is a sign of weakness in the individual, an indication that he has not been living his life in equilibrium. In actuality, however, the contrasts we may gain from what we call entertainment are necessary adjuncts to our workday life. Every area of activity that we find necessary for our physical or psychological well-being is an indication of the presence of some basic need for balance and synthesis in our lives. Entertainment may provide us with satisfactions that other experiences do not furnish.

It seems, though, that the application of moral principles to the area of entertainment is not different from an application to all other sectors of our lives. In the most general of terms, one might categorize this process as the passage from doing things spontaneously to a spontaneous or intuitive perception of a better way. Often man, in his desire to make things easier for himself, will establish an external structure to help him attain this newly desired way of life—rules and standards of morality, for instance. In order for final spontaneity to be achieved again, the formalized methods must be eliminated. Actions become consciously determined, yet naturally executed, and the individual finds himself a little closer to combining the desirable and the necessary.

# MAN IS NOT A THING

*By* ERICH FROMM

[This article by Erich Fromm (Part I of a series on "The Limitations of Psychoanalysis") first appeared in the *Saturday Review* for March 16, and is printed here by permission of the *Saturday Review*. It is offered to the readers of THEOSOPHY as evidence of the philosophical reach of the pioneers in contemporary psychology, and for the suggestive parallels with Theosophical teachings and conceptions that it contains.—Editors, THEOSOPHY.]

THE growing popularity of psychology is interpreted by many as a sign of our approach to the Delphic ideal: "Know Thyself." The idea of self-knowledge has its roots in the Greek and Judaeo-Christian tradition. It was part of the Enlightenment attitude. Men like James and Freud, deeply rooted in this tradition, helped to transmit it to us. But we must not ignore other aspects of contemporary psychology which are dangerous and destructive to human spiritual development.

Psychological knowledge has assumed a particular function in capitalistic society, a function and a meaning quite different from those which were implied in "Know Thyself." Capitalistic society is centered around the market, the commodity market and the labor market, where goods and services are exchanged freely, regardless of clan and blood relationships and other traditional standards and without force or fraud. Knowledge of the customer is of paramount importance to the seller. With the growing complexity of enterprises and capital, it becomes all the more important to know in advance the wishes of the customer, and not only to know them but to influence and manipulate them. The capital investments of modern giant enterprises are not made by hunch, but after thorough investigation and manipulation of the customer and the whole market.

Beyond "market psychology" another new field of psychology has arisen, based on the wish to understand and manipulate the employee. This is called "human relations." It is a logical outcome of the changed relationship between capital and labor. Instead of crude warfare there is cooperation between the giant colossi of enterprise and the giant colossi of labor unions, both of which have come to the conclusion that

it is in the long run more useful to compromise than to fight. In addition, we have also found that satisfied, "happy" men work more productively and provide for that smooth operation which is a necessity for big enterprises. Thus, what Taylor did for the rationalization of physical work the psychologists do for the mental and emotional aspect of the worker. He is made into a *thing,* treated and manipulated like a thing, and so-called "human relations" are the most inhuman ones, because they are "reified" and alienated relations.

From the manipulation of the customer and the worker, the uses of psychology have spread to the manipulation of everybody, to politics. While the idea of democracy originally centered around the concept of clear-thinking and responsible citizens, the practice of democracy becomes more and more distorted by the same methods of manipulation which were first developed in market research and "human relations."

While all this is well known, I want now to discuss a more subtle and difficult problem which is related to individual psychology and especially to psychoanalysis. The question is: *To which extent is psychology* (the knowledge of others and of myself) *possible?* What limitations exist to such knowledge? And what are the dangers if these limitations are not respected?

Undoubtedly the desire to know our fellow men and ourselves corresponds to a deep need in human beings. Man lives within a social context. He needs to be related to his fellow man lest he become insane. Man is endowed with reason and imagination; his fellow man and he himself are problems which he cannot help trying to solve. The endeavor to understand man by thought is called psychology, "the knowledge of the soul."

However, complete rational knowledge is possible only of *things.* Things can be dissected without being destroyed; they can be manipulated without damage to their nature; they can be reproduced. *Man is not a thing.* He cannot be dissected without being destroyed. He cannot be manipulated without being harmed. And he cannot be reproduced artificially. Life in its biological aspects is a miracle and a secret, and man in his human aspects is an unfathomable secret. We know our fellow man and ourselves in many ways, yet we do not know him or ourselves fully because we are not things. The further we reach into the depth of our being, or someone else's being, the more the goal of full knowledge eludes us. Yet we cannot help desiring to penetrate into the secret of man's soul, into the nucleus of "he."

What, then, does it mean, that we know ourselves or that we know another person? To know ourselves means to overcome the illusions we have about ourselves. To know our neighbor means to overcome the "parataxic distortions" (transference) we have about him. We all suffer, in varying degrees, from illusions about ourselves. We are enmeshed in fantasies of omniscience and omnipotence which were experienced as quite real when we were children. We rationalize our bad motives in terms of benevolence, duty, or necessity. We rationalize weakness and fear in terms of "good causes," our unrelatedness in terms of others' unresponsiveness. With our fellow man we distort and rationalize just as much, except that usually we do so in the opposite direction. Our lack of love makes him appear as hostile when he is only shy. Our submissiveness transforms him into a dominating ogre when he only asserts himself. Our fear of spontaneity makes him out to be childish, when he is really childlike and spontaneous. To know more about ourselves means to do away with the many veils which hide us and our neighbor from our view. One veil after another is lifted, one distortion after another dispelled.

Psychology can show us what man is *not*. It cannot tell us what man, each one of us, *is*. The soul of man, the unique core of each individual, can never be grasped and described adequately. It can be "known" only inasmuch as it is not misconceived. The legitimate aim of psychology, as far as ultimate knowledge is concerned, is the *negative,* the removal of distortions and illusions, *not the positive,* full, and complete knowledge of a human being.

There is, however, another path to knowing man's secret. This path is not that of thought, but of *love*. Love is active penetration of the other person in which my desire to know is stilled by union. In the act of fusion I know you, I know myself, I know everybody—and I "know" nothing. I know in the only way in which knowledge of that which is alive is possible for man—by the experience *of union,* not by any knowledge our thought can give. The only way to full knowledge lies in the act of love; this act transcends thought, it transcends words.

Psychological knowledge may be one condition for full knowledge in the act of love. I have to know the other person and myself objectively in order to be able to see his reality or, rather, in order to overcome the illusions, the irrationally distorted pictures I have of him. If I know a human being as he is, or rather if I know what he is not, then I may know him in his ultimate essence in the act of love.

Love is an achievement not easy to attain. How does the man who cannot love try to penetrate the secret of his neighbor? There is, as I have tried to show in "The Art of Loving," one other way, a desperate one, to know the secret: it is that of complete power over another person, the power which makes him do what I want, feel what I want, think what I want, which transforms him into a thing, *my* thing. The ultimate degree of this attempt to know lies in the extremes of sadism, in the desire to make a human being suffer, to torture him, to force him to betray his "secret" in his suffering or eventually to destroy him. In the craving to penetrate man's secret lies an essential motive for the depth and intensity of cruelty and destructiveness. In a very succinct way this idea has been expressed by the Russian writer Isaac Babel. He quotes a fellow officer in the Russian Civil War who has just stamped a former master to death as saying: "With shooting—I'll put it this way—with shooting you only get rid of a chap. . . . With shooting you'll never get at the soul, to where it is in a fellow and how it shows itself. But I don't spare myself, and I've more than once trampled an enemy for over an hour. You see, I want to get to know what life really is, what life's like down our way."

While sadism and destructiveness are motivated by the desire to force man's secret, it can never lead to the expected goal. By making my neighbor suffer, the distance between him and myself grows to a point where no knowledge is possible. Sadism and destructiveness are perverted, hopeless, and tragic attempts to learn.

The problem of knowing man runs parallel to the theological problem of knowing God. Negative theology postulates that I cannot make any positive statement about God. The only knowledge of God is what He is not. As Maimonides put it, the more I know about what God is not the more I know about God. Or as Meister Eckhart put it: "Meanwhile man cannot know what God is even though he be ever so well aware of what God is not." One consequence of such negative theology lies in mysticism. If I can have no full knowledge of God in thought, if theology is at best negative, the positive knowledge of God can be achieved only in the act of union with God.

Translating this principle to man, we might speak of a "negative psychology," and furthermore say that full knowledge of man by thought is impossible, and that full "knowledge" can occur only in the act of love. Just as mysticism is a logical consequence of negative theology, love is the logical consequence of negative psychology.

Stating the limitations of psychology is to point to the danger resulting from ignoring these limitations. Modern man is lonely, frightened, and little capable of love. He wants to be close to his neighbor, yet he is too unrelated and distant to be able to be close. His marginal bonds to his neighbor are manifold and easily kept up, but a deep "central relatedness" hardly exists. To find closeness he seeks knowledge; and in search of knowledge he finds psychology. Psychology becomes a substitute for love, for intimacy, for union with others and oneself; it becomes the refuge of the lonely, alienated man instead of being a step toward the act of union.

Psychology as a surrogate becomes apparent in the phenomenon of the popularity of psychoanalysis. Psychoanalysis can be most helpful in undoing the parataxic distortions within ourselves and about our fellow man. It can undo one illusion after another, and free the way to the decisive act, which we alone can perform: the "courage to be," the jump, the act of ultimate commitment. Man after his physical birth has to go through a continuous process of birth. Emerging from the mother's womb is the first act of birth; from her breast is the second; from her arm the third. From here on the process of birth can stop; a person can develop into a socially adjusted and useful person and yet remain stillborn in a spiritual sense. If he is to develop into what he potentially is as a human being, he must continue to be born. That is, he must continue to dissolve the primary ties of soil and blood. He must proceed from one act of separation to the next. He must give up certainty and defenses and take the jump into the act of commitment, concern, and love.

What happens so often in psychoanalytic treatment is that there is a silent agreement between therapist and patient which consists in the assumption that psychoanalysis is a method by which one can attain happiness and maturity and yet avoid the jump, the act, the pain of separation. To use the analogy of the jump a little further, the psychoanalytic situation looks sometimes like that of a man wanting to learn how to swim and yet intensely afraid of the moment when he has to jump into the water, to have faith in the water's buoyancy. The man stands at the edge of the pool and listens to his teacher explain to him the movements he has to make; that is good and necessary. But if we see him going on talking, talking, talking we become suspicious that the talking and understanding have become a substitute for the real swim. No amount or depth of psychological insight can take the place of the

act, the commitment, the jump. It can lead to it, prepare for it, make it possible—and this is the legitimate function of psychoanalytic work. But it must not try to be a substitute for the responsible act of commitment, an act without which no real change occurs in a human being.

If psychoanalysis is understood in this sense, another condition must be met. The analyst must overcome the alienation from himself and from his fellow man which is prevalent in modern times. As I have said, modern man experiences himself as a *thing,* an embodiment of energies to be invested profitably on the market. He experiences his fellow man as a thing to be used for profitable exchange. Contemporary psychology, psychiatry, and psychoanalysis are involved in this universal process of alienation. The patient is considered as a thing, the sum of many parts. Some of these parts are defective and need to be "fixed," like the parts of an automobile. There is a defect here and a defect there, called symptoms. The psychiatrist considers it his function to fix them. He does not look at the patient as a unique totality.

For psychoanalysis to fulfill its real possibilities, the analyst must overcome his own alienation, be capable of relating himself to the patient from core to core, and in this relatedness to open the path for the patient's spontaneous experience, and thus for the "understanding" of himself. He must not look on the patient as an object, or even be only a "participant observer." He must become one with the patient, and at the same time retain his own separateness and objectivity so that he can formulate his experiences in the act of oneness and of separateness at the same time.

The final understanding cannot be expressed fully in words. It is not an "interpretation" which describes the patient as an object with its various defects, and their genesis, but it is an overall intuitive grasp; it takes place first in the analyst and then, if the analysis is successful, in the patient. This grasp is sudden. It is an intuitive act which can be prepared by many cerebral insights but can never be replaced by them. If psychoanalysis is to develop in this direction it has still unexhausted possibilities for human transformation and spiritual change. If it remains enmeshed in the socially patterned defect of alienation it may remedy this or that defect, but it will become another tool for making man more automatized and adjusted to an alienated and basically "inhuman" society.

# ON THE LOOKOUT

## "Man Outside His Body?"

"Can man move outside his own body, look upon his body from outside, even travel outside his body, and be seen at different points by others? Scores of cases pointing toward an affimative answer to this question are now on record."

So Hornell Hart begins a chapter with the above title, in the symposium, *Beyond the Five Senses* (see Lookout for September). Mr. Hart defines his terms:

> The experience of observing and operating from a point outside one's physical body may be called a *projection of viewpoint.* Often, but not always, the person who is experiencing projection seems to himself to be occupying a tangible and visible body, which is capable of more or less voluntary movement. This will hereinafter be referred to as the *projected* body. Such experiences deserve to be called *extrasensory projection* or *extrasensory travel,* only when the testimony of the protagonist is confirmed by other trustworthy observers.

## A Not-Uncommon Experience

The projection of viewpoint, Mr. Hart states, is a "fairly wide-spread experience." He bases this assertion on the results of a questionaire submitted to Duke University students in which 30 per cent of the 155 students questioned answered "yes." Yet, although it is easy to establish the *experience* of projection by questionaire, it is much more difficult "to prove the veridicality of such projections," for to do this it is essential to have confirmation by "independent observers." Mr. Hart then relates "two spontaneous cases and two self-induced projections, and five excellently attested cases in which extrasensory travel was induced by hypnosis."

"These cases," Mr. Hart continues, "which fulfill fairly high evidential standards, would appear to be sufficient to establish a prima-facie case for the reality of extrasensory travel. Strong as the case appears to be in the light of this evidence, the findings should be taken as constituting merely a working hypothesis, to be tested further by rigorous and systematic experimentation."

Mr. Hart feels that in the light of the cases he has examined the following conclusions seem justified:

## JUSTIFIABLE CONCLUSIONS

1. Numerous cases are on record in which a human observer-operator has occupied a projected body, recognizably similar to his physical body, and that such projected bodies have seemed to their occupants to be visible, tangible, and capable of voluntary motion. Among thirty-eight cases of such purported projection, awareness of occupying a projected body was reported specifically in eleven. In most of the other cases it seems to have been taken for granted. . . .

2. Such projected bodies may be perceived as apparitions by persons who have the necessary sensitivity, who are suitably attuned to the projected personalities. Such perception may be visual, auditory, tactual, or some combination of these and other types, and may convey confirming evidence not otherwise known to the percipient. . . .

3. Such projected bodies may enable their possessors, under necessary conditions, to observe and in some ways operate. Observing one's own physical body from a point outside that body was reported in eight cases. In addition, forty-six Duke University students and twenty-six members of the American Society for Psychical Research reported such experiences.

## ESSENCE OF ESP PROJECTION

"But projection of viewpoint," Mr. Hart continues, "means more than seeing one's physical body from the outside. The essence of ESP projection consists in observing objects and people from the viewpoint of the projected body. One's own physical body is only one such object. . . . Operations performable with the projected body as a base include making adjustments to the physical environment and communicating with other persons."

That the location of the projected body may be shifted by shifts of attention is mentioned in three spontaneous cases. In hypnotic cases, the position of the traveler was shifted by suggestions from the hypnotist. In all other cases, the attention of the extrasensory traveler was strongly directed toward the place to which his body moved. However, several did not have full control over the shifts of their projected bodies. It was not so much that they decided to shift from one place to another, but rather that their attention was directed to some other location, and movement seemed to follow automatically. In several cases, the shift took place *before* any shift in conscious attention had occurred.

## PERMEABILITY OF MATTER

Passing through solid matter is another characteristic of projected bodies. This phenomenon is reported in eight cases. Trying unsuccess-

fully to move solid objects is mentioned in four of these cases. Of the Duke University students, eleven reported having experienced that their projected bodies had moved through solid matter.

## A Natural Characteristic

This "phenomenon," of course, is natural in astral projection, for as explained in H. P. Blavatsky's *Secret Doctrine*:

> The faculties, or what is perhaps the best available term, the characteristics of matter, must clearly bear a direct relation always to the senses of man. Matter has extension, colour, motion (molecular motion), taste, and smell, corresponding to the existing senses of man, and by the time that it fully develops the next characteristic—let us call it for the moment Permeability—this will correspond to the next sense of man—let us call it "Normal Clairvoyance"; thus, when some bold thinkers have been thirsting for a fourth dimension to explain the passage of matter through matter . . . what they were really in want of, was a *sixth characteristic of matter*. . . . A *partial* familiarity with the characteristic of matter—permeability—which should be developed concurrently with the sixth sense, may be expected to develop at the proper period in this Round. (*S.D.* I, 251, 258.)

## Factors in ESP Projection

To return to Mr. Hart:

> 6. ESP projection appears to be the result of three factors: (a) strong emotional tension or shock; (b) strenuous direction of attention toward the location into which the projection takes place; and (c) individual proclivity for such projections . . . The tension may even appear to have precognitive aspects; in some cases, it may not be obvious at all. . . .
>
> In final summary, however, the hypothesis of traveling by extrasensory perception seems to be supported, by reports of spontaneous and experimental cases, with such evidential strength that the likelihood of its actual occurrence seems fairly high. The major significance of the hypothesis is so great—with respect to philosophy, religion, and the whole orientation of life—that the need for further rigorous and comprehensive research in the field seems imperative.

These people, then, who now possess astral proclivities unusual in our time, may be considered to exhibit premonitory symptoms of the next Round, when astral projection will be a commonplace and "*permeability* will become so manifest a characteristic of matter, that the densest forms of this will seem to man's perceptions as obstructive to him as a thick fog, and no more."

## INTERDEPENDENCE OF THE LIFE-FORMS

In *The Web of Life* (The Devin-Adair Co., N.Y.), John H. Storer presents a fascinating picture of the interdependence of all animate and inanimate "beings." Mr. Storer shows first how the earth's crust is gradually prepared to support life, then how various forms of insect- and plant-life produce the environment necessary for animal life, and how all collaborate in providing an environment which sustains man. The plea of *The Web of Life* is for man's intelligent use of what Nature provides, instead of wantonly destroying Her work—and thus ultimately destroying himself. Speaking of the "man-made desert" of Arizona, Mr. Storer says:

> When we think of this desert it is easy to blame human greed; but it is well to remember that this answer is too simple. Greed no doubt played its part. So did imagination, initiative, hard work, the willingness to risk life and savings to gain independence. These are some of the things that we regard as among the higher attributes of man. They were vitiated by ignorance, by lack of established responsibility, and by the pressure of competition which led to the crowding of the range beyond its carrying capacity, until today in many places that carrying capacity has practically gone. This process of land destruction may go on wherever the natural covering of the soil is broken without proper provision for its protection.

## A LIVING ORGANISM

> It has been said that scientists have learned more about proper land management in the first half of the twentieth century than in all the earlier years of human existence. Underlying this new knowledge there is one basic fact—that the surface of the earth is a highly complex living organism. It can be harnessed and made very productive if it is properly treated, or, like the goose in the fable, it can be opened up and all the golden eggs removed. . . .
>
> But with all our new knowledge of land management there is still an enormous amount to be learned, and the greatest task of all is to provide the user of the land with incentives to proper management. For, every user of productive land is in fact a trustee, responsible for the lives and the future of the human race, which must still depend on that land for support.

## THE ROOT-PRINCIPLE INVERTED

The Tree of Life, having its "Root" at the highest level of Being, is inverted in the physical world, drawing its sustenance from the "elements." A description of the physical root system is very suggestive:

> A root system is a really incredible thing. Many studies have been made of its extent. In one study, a plant of winter rye grass was grown for four months in a box with less than two cubic feet of earth. In that time the plant grew twenty inches high, with about 51 square feet of surface above the ground. But underground the root system had developed 378 miles of roots and an additional 6,000 miles of root hairs. This meant an average growth of three miles of roots and 50 miles of root hairs for each day of the four-month growing season.

## Knowledge and the Deciding Test

Mr. Storer summarizes what seem to him the most important aspects of the Web of Life: (1) The endless ramifications of the environment as a whole that surrounds every living thing; (2) The teamwork and delicate balance existing between the different forces that keep life functioning on this planet; (3) The constant progression of life from the simplest plants and animals that build and prepare the soil up to man, who utilizes what all these forms of life provide; (4) The evolution of life on this planet, which appears to have reached a turning-point with the development of the human intellect; and (5) The basic contention of Mr. Storer's story:

> Scientists have proved that it is possible to use the life-supporting natural resources of the world without destroying them. These resources can be renewed and made more productive with use. This is a triumph of the human intellect. The great and deciding test, however, still remains—whether man can coordinate knowledge into understanding and build within his heart the incentives and the wisdom to use these new-found powers wisely, and with responsibility, for the common good.

## Center of Thought

The action of Mind and its possible avenues of expression is a fascinating subject for speculation by Theosophists. That it is also of interest to medical men is shown by an inquiry in the *Journal* of the American Medical Association, July 20:

"Where does the medical world consider the center of thinking to be? If this center is in the brain, in what part of the brain does it lie? According to some people the center of thinking is in the various plexuses, such as the solar plexus. What do these nerve centers have to do with thinking? And how does one interpret the Biblical quotation, 'As a man thinketh in his heart, so is he'?"

One consultant to whom this inquiry was referred answers:

Gall's original hypothesis was that the cerebral cortex was the structural basis for the "mind." After Gall's work appeared, various "centers" were found which correlated structure with function. Thus, there were found "speech centers," "motor centers," and "visual centers."

### ENTIRE CORTEX THE SUBSTRATUM

However, later work showed that no such well-demarcated and simplified centers actually exist. It is true that there are parts of the cortex to which certain functions can be designated, e. g., speech area, visual area, and sensory area. However, although specific areas in the cortex may serve as centers for higher aggregates of functions, such as language, space concepts, form, and vision, other areas subserve such functions as sensory interpretation and motor execution. There is no specific area for intellectual function or thought. The entire cortex is the substratum for thinking.

"As a man thinketh in his heart, so is he" is a poetic expression for the emotional modification of thought. Since emotions have an effect on heart rate and heart consciousness, this organ was associated with human motives and volition and hence with thought. . . . Emotional states, through the autonomic nervous system, may lead to a false localization of thinking in the solar plexus.

Where, we wonder, would the "medical world" place the thinking referred to in this passage from the *Voice*: "Thou hast to feel thyself ALL-THOUGHT, and yet exile all thoughts from out thy Soul"?

### MEDICAL SCIENCE DIVORCED FROM SOCIAL SCIENCES

June *Johns Hopkins* Magazine features an article describing a "revised program of medical education" at Johns Hopkins and listing several reasons for the need of such revision. Chief among these is the "serious deficiency [which] relates to the sharp separation which has traditionally existed in American education between the liberal arts and medical science." The article continues:

The curriculum for medical students has always been virtually cut in two by an "iron curtain" which drops precipitously at the end of college. Once he enters medical school, the prospective physician is expected to leave his interests in the humanities and social sciences behind in order to devote himself exclusively to the study of medicine. Divorced so abruptly and so completely from the pursuit of a general education, he all too frequently loses interest in everything except the technical requirements of his chosen profession. With such a system in vogue, it is not surprising that many American physicians, though technically competent, appear deficient in their social, historical, and humanistic understanding, even in matters closely related to health.

## A Cardinal Principle of Education

The trend toward specialization, so popular earlier in the century, is seen to have resulted in a one-sided development, curtailing in particular the urge toward further self-education along broad cultural lines. The Johns Hopkins revised program endeavors to correct the limitations of this system without preventing later specialization. As the article puts it:

> One of the cardinal principles of higher education is the encouragement of the thorough mastery of knowledge through participation in the processes of discovery. It inevitably leads to emphasis upon scholarly teachers, upon free time, upon depth of study, and upon the cultivation of individual initiative. With this emphasis goes mistrust of superficial "orientation" courses, of minutely prescribed schedules, and of passive learning. . . .
>
> This basic principle of advanced learning is violated all too often in American graduate schools, particularly in schools of medicine. Too much time is devoted to the passive absorption of factual information and too little to the active acquisition of knowledge. Active learning in medical school can be encouraged only through laboratory, clinical, and library research, guided by faculty advisers, but pursued because of the student's own initiative. For such independent study, generous blocks of free time must be provided in the curriculum. . . . The Revised Program is designed specifically to promote sound habits of self-education at the earliest possible stage in the career of each medical student.

## Universal Order, Moral Order are One

The philosophy a man lives determines his outlook on life and motivates his actions. Conversely, a man's actions indicate his basic philosophy. Thus, we would expect Norman Cousins (whose *Saturday Review* editorials have frequently been quoted in Lookout) to have many ideas in common with Theosophists. That this is the case may be seen by the following quotations, taken from a newspaper column, "This I Believe," Jan. 28, under Mr. Cousins' by-line, and showing a fervor for universal brotherhood that we might well emulate:

> I am a single cell in a body of two billion cells. The body is mankind.
>
> I glory in the individuality of self, but my individuality does not separate me from my universal self—the oneness of man. My memory is personal and finite, but my substance is boundless and infinite. The portion of that substance that is mine was not devised; it was renewed. So long as the human bloodstream lives I shall live.

> I do not believe that humankind is an excrescence or a machine, or that the solar systems and galaxies in the universe lack order or sanction. . . . I see no separation between the universal order and the moral order.

### REACHES OF UNDERSTANDING

> I believe that the expansion of knowledge makes for an expansion of faith, and the widening of the horizons of mind for a widening of belief. My reason nourishes my faith and my faith my reason. . . . Human unity is the fulfillment of diversity. It is the harmony of opposites. It is a many-stranded texture, with color and depth. The sense of humanity makes possible a reverence for life.
>
> Reverence for life is more than solicitude or sensitivity for life. It is a sense of the whole, a capacity for wonder, a respect for the intricate universe of individual life. It is the supreme awareness of awareness itself. It is pride in being. . . .
>
> My dedication, therefore, is to the cause of man in the attainment of that which is within the reach of man. I will work for human unity under a purposeful peace. I will work for the growth of a moral order that is in keeping with the universal order.
>
> In this way do I affirm faith in life and life in faith.

### A BELIEF MANIFESTED IN ACTION

This credo explains, we think, why *SR* welcomes to its pages such outstanding articles as Erich Fromm's "The Limitations of Psychoanalysis," and why the *Saturday Review* (May 18) "has the honor of being the only American magazine or newspaper to publish in full the complete text of the 'Declaration of Conscience,' by Dr. Albert Schweitzer."

Actually, Dr. Schweitzer's public Declaration seems to have been a direct outcome of Mr. Cousins' visit to Lambarene early in 1957—a visit made with the express intent of getting Dr. Schweitzer's views on "the implications of nuclear warfare and experimentation," for it was during their discussion that Mr. Cousins asked Dr. Schweitzer "if he did not think that it was important to say publicly" what he told the *SR* editor; and it was Mr. Cousins' deep concern and insistence that prevailed on Dr. Schweitzer to formulate his Declaration.

# THE UNITED LODGE OF THEOSOPHISTS

## DECLARATION

The policy of this Lodge is independent devotion to the cause of Theosophy, without professing attachment to any Theosophical organization. It is loyal to the great Founders of the Theosophical Movement, but does not concern itself with dissensions or differences of individual opinion.

The work it has on hand and the end it keeps in view are too absorbing and too lofty to leave it the time or inclination to take part in side issues. That work and that end is the dissemination of the Fundamental Principles of the philosophy of Theosophy, and the exemplification in practice of those principles, through a truer realization of the SELF; a profounder conviction of Universal Brotherhood.

It holds that the unassailable basis for union among Theosophists, wherever and however situated, is "similarity of aim, purpose and teaching," and therefore has neither Constitution, By-Laws nor Officers, the sole bond between its Associates being that basis. And it aims to disseminate this idea among Theosophists in the furtherance of Unity.

It regards as Theosophists all who are engaged in the true service of Humanity, without distinction of race, creed, sex, condition or organization, and

It welcomes to its association all those who are in accord with its declared purposes and who desire to fit themselves, by study and otherwise, to be the better able to help and teach others.

*"The true Theosophist belongs to no cult or sect; yet belongs to each and all."*

---

*Being in sympathy with the purposes of this Lodge, as set forth in its "Declaration," I hereby record my desire to be enrolled as an Associate, it being understood that such association calls for no obligation on my part, other than that which I, myself, determine.*

The foregoing is the form signed by Associates of the United Lodge of Theosophists. Inquiries are invited from all persons to whom this Movement may appeal. Cards for signatures will be sent upon request, and every possible assistance furnished Associates in their studies and in efforts to form local Lodges. There are no fees of any kind, and no formalities to be complied with. Write to:

GENERAL REGISTRAR, UNITED LODGE OF THEOSOPHISTS,
Theosophy Hall, 33rd and Grand Ave., Los Angeles 7, Calif.

### U. L. T. LODGES

AMSTERDAM, Z. HOLLAND ..... 123 Stadionweg
ANTWERP, (BERCHEM) BELGIUM ..... Transvaal Straat 62
BANGALORE CITY, INDIA ..... 15 Sir Krishna Rao Rd., Basavangudi
BERKELEY 4, CALIFORNIA ..... Masonic Temple Bldg., Bancroft and Shattuck
BOMBAY 1, INDIA ..... 51 Mahatma Gandhi Road
LAGUNA BEACH, CALIFORNIA ..... 1175 South Coast Boulevard
LEIDEN, HOLLAND ..... Roodenburgerstraat 35
LONDON W. 2, ENGLAND ..... Robert Crosbie House, 62 Queen's Gardens
LONDON, ONTARIO, CANADA ..... 524 William Street
LOS ANGELES 7, CALIFORNIA ..... 245 West 33rd Street
MATUNGA, BOMBAY 19, INDIA ..... Anandi Nivas, Bhaudaji Road
NEW YORK 21, NEW YORK ..... 347 East 72nd Street
PARIS 16, FRANCE ..... 11 bis rue Keppler
PHILADELPHIA 3, PENNSYLVANIA ..... 1917 Walnut Street
PHOENIX, ARIZONA ..... 32 North Central Avenue
READING, PENNSYLVANIA ..... 812 North Fifth Street
SACRAMENTO 14, CALIFORNIA ..... 1237½ H Street
SAN DIEGO 3, CALIFORNIA ..... 3148 Fifth Avenue
SAN FRANCISCO 14, CALIFORNIA ..... 166 Sanchez Street
SAN LEANDRO, CALIFORNIA ..... 579 Foothill Boulevard
SYDNEY, AUSTRALIA ..... Federation House, 166 Phillip Street
WASHINGTON 9, D. C. ..... 1722 Connecticut Ave., N.W.

# THEOSOPHICAL PUBLICATIONS

## Books by H. P. Blavatsky:

| | |
|---|---|
| ISIS UNVEILED, a photographic facsimile of the Original Edition, the two volumes bound in one | $ 7.50 |
| THE SECRET DOCTRINE, facsimile edition, two volumes in one | 8.50 |
| INDEX TO THE SECRET DOCTRINE, for students | 3.00 |
| THE SECRET DOCTRINE *and* INDEX | 11.00 |
| THE KEY TO THEOSOPHY, facsimile of Original Edition | 3.00 |
| THEOSOPHICAL GLOSSARY, facsimile of Original Edition | 5.00 |
| TRANSACTIONS OF THE BLAVATSKY LODGE | 2.50 |
| THE VOICE OF THE SILENCE | 1.50 |

## Books by William Q. Judge:

| | |
|---|---|
| THE OCEAN OF THEOSOPHY | 2.00 |
| LETTERS THAT HAVE HELPED ME, new and enlarged edition | 3.00 |
| THE BHAGAVAD-GITA | 1.50 |
| NOTES ON THE BHAGAVAD-GITA | 2.50 |
| PATANJALI'S YOGA APHORISMS | 1.50 |
| THE HEART DOCTRINE, selections from Wm. Q. Judge | 2.00 |
| VERNAL BLOOMS, selected articles from W.Q.J. (paper cover) | 1.00 |

## Other Books:

| | |
|---|---|
| THE FRIENDLY PHILOSOPHER, Letters and Talks by Robert Crosbie | 3.00 |
| ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON THE "OCEAN," by Robert Crosbie | 2.00 |
| THE ETERNAL VERITIES, for children, new edition | 2.00 |
| TEACHER'S MANUAL AND GUIDE TO THE "ETERNAL VERITIES" | 2.50 |
| "BECAUSE—" FOR THE CHILDREN WHO ASK WHY | 2.00 |
| LIGHT ON THE PATH, written down by "M.C." (Bombay Ed.) | .75 |
| THROUGH THE GATES OF GOLD, written down by "M.C." | 1.50 |
| OCCULT TALES, by H. P. Blavatsky and Wm. Q. Judge | 2.00 |
| FROM THE BOOK OF IMAGES, a volume of Indian tales | 3.00 |
| THE THEOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT, 1875-1950 | 5.00 |
| SELECTIONS FROM THE UPANISHADS, AND THE TAO TE KING | 2.00 |
| THE DHAMMAPADA | 2.00 |

## Pamphlets:

| | |
|---|---|
| THEOSOPHY SIMPLY STATED (10 copies, 50 cents; 50 copies, $2.00) | .10 |
| CONVERSATIONS ON THEOSOPHY, including the "Three Fundamentals" | .10 |
| REINCARNATION AND KARMA, the "Aphorisms," by Wm. Q. Judge | .10 |
| THOUGHTS FOR THINKERS, a helpful essay | .10 |
| WHAT IS DEATH? | .10 |
| THE VOCATION OF LIFE | .10 |
| THE UNITED LODGE OF THEOSOPHISTS, its history, purpose, and methods | .25 |
| FIVE MESSAGES TO AMERICAN THEOSOPHISTS, by H. P. Blavatsky | .25 |
| EPITOME OF THEOSOPHY, by William Q. Judge | .25 |
| ECHOES FROM THE ORIENT, by William Q. Judge | .50 |
| MORAL EDUCATION, new and enlarged edition | .50 |
| A CHRISTIAN AND A THEOSOPHIST | .25 |
| THE LAWS OF HEALING, Physical and Metaphysical | .50 |
| STATES AFTER DEATH, and Spiritualistic "Communications" Explained | .35 |
| CYCLES OF PSYCHISM, The Import of Psychic Evolution | .50 |
| HYPNOTISM—A PSYCHIC MALPRACTICE | .25 |
| WHAT IS THEOSOPHY? A collation from H. P. Blavatsky | .25 |

*Prices subject to change without notice. Order from*


## THE THEOSOPHY COMPANY

245 West 33rd Street, Los Angeles 7, California
347 East 72nd Street, New York 21. New York